



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

BS
186
.S72
1858

Harvard Divinity School
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

*Purchased from the income of a
fund given in memory of*

JOSEPH HENRY THAYER

Bussey Professor of New Testament

1884-1901





STATEMENTS, AND DOCUMENTS,

CONCERNING THE RECENT ACTION

OF

The Board of Managers

OF THE

AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY,

TOUCHING THE

STANDARD EDITION OF THE ENGLISH SCRIPTURES,
AS CIRCULATED BY THAT SOCIETY.

PUBLISHED BY MEMBERS OF THE LATE COMMITTEE ON VERSIONS.

NEW YORK:

N. A. CALKINS, PUBLISHER,
348 BROADWAY.

1858.



STATEMENTS, AND DOCUMENTS,

CONCERNING THE RECENT ACTION

OF

The Board of Managers

OF THE

AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY,

TOUCHING THE

STANDARD EDITION OF THE ENGLISH SCRIPTURES,
AS CIRCULATED BY THAT SOCIETY.

PUBLISHED BY MEMBERS OF THE LATE COMMITTEE ON VERSIONS.

NEW YORK:

JOHN F. TROW, BOOK & JOB PRINTER, 377 & 379 BROADWAY.
1858.

Bequest of
Prof. J. H. Thayer
March 20, 1902,
(1977)

BS
186
S72
1858

CONTENTS.

Extracts from the original Report of the Committee on Versions (1851),	pp. 5—13
Characteristics of the recent Standard Edition,	pp. 13—24
Approving Action of the Board and Secretaries,	pp. 24—26
Opposition to the Standard Edition,	pp. 26—30
Report of Committee on Versions, Nov. 1857,	pp. 30—34
Second Series of Resolutions of do.,	pp. 35—36
Majority Report of Select Committee,	pp. 37—40
Minority Report of do.,	pp. 40—43
Action of the Board of Managers,	pp. 43—44
Protest of Members of the Committee on Versions,	pp. 44—47
Dr. Turner's paper of Resignation,	pp. 67—70
Conclusion,	pp. 70—71

APPENDIX.

A. Paper by Dr. Turner, read to the Board Nov. 19, 1857,	pp. 72—83
B. Article showing past changes in the Version,	pp. 84—89
C. Review of the Majority Report,	pp. 90—98
D. Report of Dr. Blayney (1769),	pp. 99—102
E. Reply to recent statements of Dr. Brigham,	pp. 103—112

NOTE, TO THE PUBLIC.

THE undersigned, members of the late Committee on Versions of the American Bible Society, have caused the following documents to be printed, for the more ready and convenient use of those who may have occasion to refer to them, now or hereafter. Some of them have already been before the public, but in a form less compact and convenient than the present, as well as more fugitive. Several of them, and some of these among the more important of the series, have never before been printed.

It is in no contentious or litigious temper, and in no spirit of pique, that the undersigned make this publication. Having been elected, by the unsolicited and unanimous votes of the Board of Managers, to the office from which they are now discharged ; having served the Society in that office, one of them for twenty years, and all of them save one for more than ten years, at frequent sacrifice of their personal convenience ; having adopted no measure, in the course of their administration of the interests intrusted to them, without free discussion and cordial agreement ; and having had the most ample testimonials, from many quarters, of the value and importance of the work they had accomplished ; they have seen with pain the recent departure by the Board of Managers, from principles which heretofore have been recognized and established in the usage of the Society, as proper and wise.

They regard the new principles, thus introduced, as fraught with evil and danger to the Society ; at once injurious to its future usefulness, and singularly inconsistent with its previous history. Entertaining these convictions, therefore, they feel called in duty to present the following statements and papers to the Society and the Public. And they solicit for them the candid attention, and the careful consideration, of all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth.

If any thing herein contained shall give pain to any, they can only disavow fully, at the outset, the intention of injuring the feelings of any one to whom reference is made in the following papers. If any thing herein contained shall tend to enlighten the minds of any, on these great questions which concern all lovers of the American Bible Society, and of that revered and consecrated version which this Society was organized to distribute, they can only render hearty thanks to Him who makes the humblest means effective by His might.

To preserve the common English translation of His Holy Word in its integrity, and to make its sacred "apples of gold" shine out more brightly through "pictures of silver," has been their only aim and hope, in their labors as a committee. And to His service they dedicate this, as all their other works and words.

(Signed,) EDWARD ROBINSON.
 SAMUEL H. TURNER.
 THOMAS COCK.
 THOMAS E. VERMILYE.
 JAMES FLOY.
 R. S. STORRS, JR.

STATEMENT
OF THE
WORK PERFORMED BY THE COMMITTEE ON VERSIONS, IN PREPARING
THE REVISED STANDARD EDITION OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

The matter of preparing a Standard Edition of the Holy Scriptures in English, of the version in common use, was assigned by the Board of Managers to the Committee on Versions in October, 1847. It was taken in hand by the committee in February, 1848 ; and was thereafter diligently and patiently prosecuted by them, until May, 1851, when they made their final and full Report to the Board, and to the Society, of what they had done. This Report, having been unanimously adopted by the Board, was published at the time, and has been republished since, and widely distributed. In order, however, to present a clear view at the outset of the work which the committee performed, and which was at that time so heartily accepted and approved by the Board, such parts of the Report (of 1851) as have a bearing upon this are here republished.

SPECIMENS OF VARIATIONS.

The Committee deem it important, in this connection, to lay before the Board some specimens of the variations and discrepancies in respect to which they have been called to decide, and of the changes which they have seen fit to adopt both in the Text and its Accessories. The Board and all other persons will thus be in a situation to judge of the manner in which the Committee have fulfilled their work ; and of the degree of confidence which may properly be felt in the results.

1. IN THE TEXT.

It will be apparent from an inspection of the rules above given, that the great and leading object of the Committee has everywhere been *uniformity*. It is only where the British copies differ, that any question has been raised; except in a few instances to be noted in the sequel. It has been the wish and endeavor of the Committee, to see the English Version restored, so far as possible, to its original purity; saving the necessary changes of orthography and other like variations, which would assuredly be acceptable to the translators themselves, were they living at the present day. The Committee have had no authority and no desire to go behind the translators; nor in any respect to touch the original version of the text; unless in cases of evident inadvertence or inconsistency, open and manifest to all.

WORDS. Here, on the very threshold, we light upon an inconsistency in respect to the gender of a pronoun in the edition of 1611, which all the modern editions have only made worse. Thus in Ruth 3, 15, all the present copies read: "and she went into the city;" but the Hebrew and the translators have it: "and he went into the city." Again, in Cant. 2, 7, all the present copies read: "nor awake *my* love, till he please;" but the Hebrew and the translators: "till *she* please." Yet in Cant. 3, 5, and 8, 4, where the Hebrew is precisely the same, the translators and all the copies have: "till he please." All these instances have of course been corrected according to the Hebrew.

Another change of a word occurs in Josh. 19, 2; where the recent copies read: "and Sheba;" but the translators have: "or Sheba." Here the Hebrew may in itself be taken either way; but the number of thirteen cities specified in v. 6, requires "or."

In Matt. 12, 41, which reads in all the copies: * "shall rise up in judgment," the Committee have not hesitated to insert the definite article: "in the judgment." This is required by the Greek; and the same Greek phrase, in v. 42, is so rendered by the translators, and is so read in all the copies.

ORTHOGRAPHY. The Committee entertain a reverence for the antique forms of words and orthography in the Bible, where they do not conflict with a clear understanding of the sense. Indeed, it is such forms, in a measure, which impart an air of dignity and venerableness to our version. For this reason, phrases like: "hoised up the mainsail," Acts 27, 40; also words like "graff" and "graфф," Rom. 11, 17. 19. 23. 24; have not been altered. But when these forms have become obsolete and unintelligible; or have already been changed in some places and not in others; or where in themselves they are of no importance; there seems to be no valid reason for longer retaining them. By far the greater portion of the readers of the English Bible are unlearned per-

* *i. e.*, in the six copies collated. The article is found inserted, however, in quite a number of early editions.

sons and children ; and it is essential to remove every thing in the mere form, which may become to any a stumbling-block in the way of the right and prompt understanding of God's holy Word. * * * * *

In expressing the *Plurals* of such Hebrew words as are not rendered in the text, the translators adopted the plural form of the Hebrew in *-im*, but with the superfluous addition of an *s* ; as *cherubims*, *seraphims*, *Nethinims*, *Anakims*, etc. This is strictly wrong, and is not in accordance with present usage. The *s* has therefore everywhere been dropped in such words ; as Gen. 3, 24. Is. 6, 2. 6. etc.

PROPER NAMES. There exists in the Old Testament a very considerable diversity in the mode of writing Hebrew proper names in English. Thus the names of the first seven patriarchs of the world, as they appear in Gen. ch. 4, and as they are now usually written, are : Adam, Seth, Enos, Cainan, Mahalaleel, Jared, Enoch. But in 1 Chr. 1, 1 *sq.* the same are recorded as : Adam, Sheth, Enosh, Kenan, Mahalaleel, Jared, Henoch ; the Hebrew forms being in both places precisely the *same*. This is but a single specimen ; and shows at least an inadvertence on the part of the translators. In some instances, also, there is a slight difference even in the Hebrew forms themselves in different books. In cases like the preceding, involving as they do a difference of pronunciation, the Committee have not felt themselves authorized to introduce any change ; regarding the great principle of uniformity in the copies as of higher importance.

In the New Testament the case is somewhat different. Here it is to be regretted, that, in respect to persons *already known in the Old Testament*, the translators did not retain their names in the form in which they had thus become familiar. Instead of this, they have often introduced the personages of ancient Jewish history under names modified, and sometimes disguised, by transmission through the Greek tongue. Thus in Acts 7, 45, and Heb. 4, 8, we find the name *Jesus*, which the common reader will naturally refer only to the Saviour ; while in reality it is simply the Greek form for *Joshua*, and should properly have been so written. In the same way the name *Core*, in Jude 11, is unintelligible to most readers ; for comparatively few would ever suspect its identity with the *Korah* of the Old Testament. So, too, the translators have sometimes taken the form of the Greek genitive *Juda*, *Jona*, to represent the Hebrew names *Judah*, *Jonah*.

The principle adopted in such cases has been the following : When such names occur singly in the narrative, and there would arise no marked difference in the pronunciation, the form in the Old Testament has been restored. The name *Jesus*, as above cited, is explained in the margin by the translators themselves.

* * * * *

CAPITAL LETTERS. The ninth rule provides for the manner of writing the

term *Scripture* or *Scriptures*, with or without a capital letter. A similar rule has been followed in practice in respect to the word "Spirit;" which everywhere is made to begin with a capital when it refers to the Spirit of God as a divine agent; but not when it denotes other spiritual beings or the spirit of man. The following is a specimen of changes which have been made :

	<i>English Copies.</i>	<i>Corrected.</i>
Gen. 6, 8.	My spirit	My Spirit
	So too Gen. 41, 38. Num. 24, 2.	
Ps. 21, 7.	most High	Most High
Is. 63, 10.	holy Spirit	Holy Spirit
Rev. 4, 5.	seven Spirits of God	seven spirits of God.

WORDS IN ITALICS. These were inserted by the translators to fill out the English idiom, in cases where the Hebrew and Greek usage omits the copula or other connecting or dependent words. These insertions were carefully revised and compared with the original by Dr. Blaney; but notwithstanding his diligence, quite a number of errors have been detected, some of which belong to the translators. The following are examples :

Ex. 8, 21. 22. 24. 29. 31. Here the recent copies all read: "swarms of *flies*"; while in Ps. 78, 45, and 105, 81, the same Hebrew word is rendered: "divers sorts of flies," without Italics. In all these passages the edition of 1611 has no Italics.

Judg. 9, 53. The edition of 1611 and all others here read: "and all to brake his skull." This has been often misunderstood, and has been sometimes printed: "and all to break." But "all to" is an antique form signifying "altogether," and was last so used by Milton. It here gives an emphasis to "brake," which is not in the Hebrew. The Committee have therefore put *all-to* in Italics, with a hyphen; and have inserted a note of explanation in the margin.

Ps. 89, 84. "the thing that is gone out of my lips." So without Italics in the edition of 1611 and all British copies. The American has, correctly, *that is*, in Italics.

Luke 1, 85. "which shall be born of thee." So in all the copies first and last; but the words of *thee* should be in Italic; there being nothing corresponding in the Greek.

John 10, 28, 29, "any man . . . no man;" so in the edition of 1611. The Oxford copy rightly reads: "any *man* . . . no *man*;" the Edinburgh and American have: "any . . . none." Corrected like the Oxford: "any *man* . . . no *man*."

PUNCTUATION. It was found that the three English copies have a general uniformity in respect to punctuation, especially in the frequent use of the colon; while the Edinburgh and American often prefer the semicolon, and are in general more conformed to the edition of 1611. The seventh rule prescribes, that "the uniform usage of any *three* of the copies shall be followed." In the great majority of instances, the operation of the rule has produced conformity with the English copies. In cases where the rule was not applicable, the Committee have endeavored to decide each according to its own merits.

The following five changes made in the punctuation, are all, it is believed, which affect the sense :

Rom. 4, 1. "that Abraham, our Father, as pertaining to the flesh hath found." Here, according to the order of the Greek, it should read : "hath found as pertaining to the flesh." The true pointing, therefore, is a comma after Abraham, and another after father. This is found in no edition hitherto.*

1 Cor. 16, 22. "let him be Anathema. Maran atha." There should be a period after Anathema which no edition inserts. The two words "Maran atha" are simply an Aramaean formula signifying "The Lord cometh;" compare Phil. 4, 5.

2 Cor. 10, 8-11. All the copies now have a colon after v. 8, and a period after v. 9, connecting the two verses in sense. The true pointing, however, is a period after v. 8, and then a colon after v. 9 and also v. 10; thus connecting v. 9 as protasis with v. 11 as apodosis. So Chrysostom, and so the Syriac and Latin versions; and this is required by the logical sequence.

Heb. 18, 7. Here should be a period at the end of the verse after "conversation." So the translators, the Oxford, and other copies. The Edinburgh and American have sometimes a colon, and sometimes a comma.

Rev. 18, 8. Here a comma is inserted after "slain;" since the qualification "from the foundation of the world" refers not to "slain," but to "written;" as is shown by the parallel verse, Rev. 17, 8. The translators wrongly insert a comma after "Lamb;" others put no stop at all.

PARENTHESES. Our collation has shown, that very many parentheses have been introduced into the text since the edition of 1611. Some of these are fit and proper; but in general they only mar the beauty of the page, without adding any thing to perspicuity. In some instances, too, they have the force of commentary. For these reasons, those not inserted by the translators have been in great part omitted; as in Rom. 5, 13-17. 11, 8. 2 Cor. 12, 2.

BRACKETS. These are found but once, 1 John 2, 23, enclosing the last clause of the verse, which the translators put in Italic. This was done, because that clause was not then contained in the Received Text of the Greek New Testament; although the sense requires it, and it was read in the best manuscripts and in the Versions. The clause is now inserted in all critical editions of the Greek Testament; and as there is no question of its genuineness, both the brackets and the Italics have been dropped.

II. IN THE ACCESSORIES OF THE TEXT.

We here tread on different ground. The edition of 1611 contained indeed valuable accessories of the text; and these have been continued, and are greatly increased, in many of the editions at the present day. But it is the text, and strictly nothing but the text, that constitutes the Bible. Of the many editions published by this Society, and by the British and Foreign Bible Society, by far the greater number, and the great multitude of copies, comprise the text alone, with the briefest possible accessories.

* This was a mistake. The same pointing occurs in the London edition collated.

CONTENTS OF THE CHAPTERS. These, as found in the larger copies of the Bible, have mostly come down to us from the translators. Some of these summaries early gave rise to remark; especially that originally prefixed to Ps. 149: "The prophet exhorteth to praise God for his love to the church, 5 and for that power which he hath given to the church to rule the consciences of men." In the later copies, the last clause: "to rule the consciences of men," is omitted.* Many minor changes were also made in the edition of Dr. Blaney.—In the editions without references, for common readers or for ordinary distribution, and particularly in the Edinburgh and American editions, these summaries have often been greatly abbreviated, and sometimes wholly omitted.

Such a summary, in full, ought to comprise a reference to the main incidents or points in each chapter; expressed in the briefest form consistent with perspicuity; and, so far as possible, in words contained in the text. There should be no ambiguity and no prolixity; and, above all, there should be no comment. In all these particulars, the contents of chapters in the larger Bibles are very frequently deficient; and the Committee have endeavored to apply the above principles, in making such alterations as seemed in each case to be required. Their attention has been mainly directed to the change of quaint, obsolete, ambiguous, or inappropriate words and expressions; to a greater condensation and conformity with the language of the text; and to the removal of comment.

As specimens of the changes made under the first of these heads, the following may suffice:

- Gen. 20. He is healed by Abraham's prayer.
Corrected. At the intercession of Abraham he is healed.
- Gen. 22. Isaac is exchanged with a ram.
Corr. A ram is sacrificed instead of Isaac.
- Gen. 50. He dieth, and is cheated.
Corr. He dieth, and is embalmed.
- Lev. 18. Unlawful lusts.
Corr. Abominable lusts.
- Num. 3. The firstborn are freed by the Levites.
Corr. The Levites are taken instead of the firstborn.
- Num. 14. Moses persuadeth God, etc.
Corr. Moses intercedeth with God, etc.
- 1 Sam. 16. Samuel sent by God, under pretence of a sacrifice, cometh to Beth-lehem.
Corr. Samuel sent to Beth-lehem to anoint one of the sons of Jesse.
- Esth. 5. he buildeth for him a pair of gallows.
Corr. he buildeth a gallows for him.

* Lewis' History of the English Bible, p. 380.

Is. 45. He convinceth the idols of vanity.

Corr. The vanity of idols.

Ex. 18. God reproveth the unjust parable of sour grapes.

Corr. God reproveth the people for their unjust parable of the sour grapes.

Matt. 1. The angel satisfieth the misdeeming thoughts of Joseph.

Corr. The angel removeth the doubts of Joseph.

Matt. 22. and poseth the Pharisees about the Messias.

Corr. Christ the Son of David.

In the matter of *condensation* and greater *conformity* with the language of the text, the changes have also not been infrequent. Most readers of the Bible are perhaps not aware, that the words *Christ* and *the church* are neither of them found in our version of the text of the Old Testament; the corresponding terms being there *Messiah* and *Zion*; see Dan. 9, 25, 26. Ps. 149, 2. Is. 61, 3, 66, 8. Yet in the contents of the chapters the former words are often employed; thus departing from the language of the text, and in fact introducing comment. An example is the summary prefixed to Ps. 149, quoted above; which, as amended, now reads:

"The psalmist exhorteth to praise God for his love to Zion, 5 and for that power which he hath given to the saints." Other examples of the like kind are the following: * * * * *

A special example of commentary is found in the contents of all the chapters in the Song of Solomon; which everywhere present, as the subject of the book, the mutual love of Christ and the church. The Committee fully believe, that this poem is intended to symbolize the mystical union between God or Christ and the souls of believers on earth, either individually or collectively; but nothing of this is expressed in the literal language of the text. The two persons introduced as speaking are everywhere the spouse or bride (ch. 4, 8-12. 5, 1) and her beloved. In accordance with this view, all the summaries of this book have been recast.

RUNNING HEADS OF THE COLUMNS. These have always been varied, and are still varied, in almost every edition; inasmuch as scarcely any two different editions have the pages and columns precisely alike. In the editions now in preparation by the Committee, these heads have been arranged by the Collator, under the supervision of the Sub-Committee, with special reference to brevity, appropriateness, and conformity with the text.

MARGINAL REFERENCES. Here the translators were limited, by the king's seventh rule, to "such quotations of places, as shall serve for the fit references of one Scripture to another." The edition of 1611 exhibits comparatively few. They were greatly increased first by Canne, whose selection was several times reprinted in England and Scotland; and last of all, and very extensively, as we have seen, by Dr. Blaney. He seems not always to have confined himself to Canne's rule, to insert only "so far as the margin could contain;" for

in some instances the bottom of the column is also occupied with references. Here, likewise, the object of the Committee has been, not revision, but uniformity; and only in a few instances have they diminished the number on an over-full page, by omitting some of those, which, on actual examination, proved to be of little or no importance. Here, too, in printing, the reference letters with the text under each are separated by a printer's lead; in order that the eye may the more readily catch the reference.

* * * * *

Such is the account which the Committee have to render to the Board of Managers, of their stewardship in this work; although this account, and the few specimens above presented, can of course afford no adequate idea of the time, the attention, and the labor bestowed on the work by the Sub-Committee and the Collator during the period of three years. And now, invoking the continued blessing of the Most High, and with a deep sense of their own imperfections, the Committee would commend the result of their labors to the favorable consideration of the Board, as also of the Society, and of the Christian public. They claim no special freedom from error; they may, very possibly, not always have fully carried out their own rules; they may have committed oversights. But they shrink from no responsibility; and they have no desire to cover up, either what they have done, or what they have left undone. The thing has not been done in a corner.

As illustrating the necessity of the present collation, and the remarks already made upon the exposure to variation and error in the printing of so many millions of copies, it may suffice here to mention, that the number of variations recorded by the collator solely in the text and punctuation of the six copies compared, falls but little short of *Twenty-Four Thousand*. Yet of all this great number, there is not one, which mars the integrity of the text, or affects any doctrine or precept of the Bible.

In thus closing their labors, the Committee desire, with grateful praise to God, distinctly and formally to state, that *no decision whatever has been made, and nothing whatever has been done, except with ENTIRE UNANIMITY on the part of the Committee and those acting with them.*

In behalf also of their able coadjutor, the Rev. Mr. McLane, the Committee would record their testimony to his fidelity, diligence, and accuracy, in the work of collation, and in bringing to their notice the various points which required attention. His task has been one of great labor, requiring minute accuracy and much patience. May he find a rich reward in the precious fruit of knowledge and experience thus acquired; and so be permitted to reap an abundant harvest in the Master's field.

In conclusion, the Committee would present for consideration and adoption by the Board the two following **RESOLUTIONS**:

1. That the Octavo Reference Bible, now in the course of preparation under the direction of the Committee on Versions, be adopted as the Standard Copy of this Society; to which all future editions published by the Society shall be conformed.

2. That, in order to carry out the preceding Resolution, the Committee on Versions be charged with the supervision of the Press; and the Superintendent of Printing and the Proof Readers be responsible to them.

All which is respectfully submitted.

GARDINER SPRING,
THOMAS COCK,
SAMUEL H. TURNER,
EDWARD ROBINSON,
THOMAS E. VERMILYE,
JOHN MCCLINTOCK,
RICHARD S. STORES, JR.

*Committee
on
Versions.*

BIBLE HOUSE, May 1st, 1851.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STANDARD EDITION THUS PREPARED.

It will be readily seen, from the preceding extracts, what were the characteristics attempted to be combined by the Committee in the standard edition of the Holy Scriptures thus prepared by them. They wished and labored, with the full coöperation, as they were assured, of the Secretaries of the Society, as well as with the express authority and approval of the Board of Managers, to make a better edition than had ever before been made of "THE VERSION IN COMMON USE;" not to substitute another version for this, either in whole or in any part. They had no intention or wish to "go behind the translators" in the interpretation of any clause, or phrase, or word, of the sacred text. And the very few and slight instances in which they differed in regard to the words of the text from other recent editions, and also from those of the translators in 1611, were designed and understood by them to be simply *corrections of original typographical errors*, and not the introduction of any new elements into the revered translation itself. It is a matter of sincere gratification with them, that amid all the strange misapprehensions and the strenuous oppositions which have arisen and been manifested, within a few months, toward them and

their work, the sacred text, as revised by them, is admitted by the more intelligent even of their assailants, to have been the most perfect thus far printed in any edition of the English Scriptures.

In regard to the usual Accessories of the text, especially to the Headings of the chapters and of the columns, the Committee felt themselves to be less restricted, as they directly, in so many words, stated in their Report; and in these, accordingly, they recommended changes from all previous editions, wherever such seemed to them to be demanded by the contents of the text, and by the just claims of those who would read this. As their course in this respect has recently been made the subject of very wide and vehement assault, they submit some general views of the matter, with a few classified specimens of the changes thus authorized by them.

Long before the late Committee of Versions was constituted, or the American Bible Society itself was formed, the "Headings" and "Contents of Chapters" in the common British editions of the version of King James, had been, at different times and by different persons, *materially altered, and extensively abridged*, from the original forms prepared by Drs. Bilson and Smith for the First Edition of the version in 1611. The Edinburgh editions had differed from the Oxford, for many years. Successive Oxford editions had varied from each other. Dr. Blaney had introduced entirely new Headings, in many cases. Some things had been amended in every edition. As one signal instance of this universal change may be cited the summary at the head of the 149th psalm. In the edition of 1611 this stood: "The Prophet exhorteth to praise God for his love to the Church, and for that power which He hath given to the Church TO RULE THE CONSCIENCES OF MEN." The Oxford quarto edition, of 1754, follows this fully. The London folio, of 1720, puts instead of "to rule the consciences of men," "*for the conversion of sinners.*" The Edinburgh edition of 1793, reads simply: "And for that power which He hath given to his

saints." The Oxford, of 1841 and of 1852, omit entirely the last clause. Other instances, if not equal to this, might be specified, in which *no edition whatever, now printed*, accords with the Headings of 1611; while it is patent to everybody having access to them, that the great mass of the editions printed in England for the last hundred years have given at the most only abridgments of those earlier Headings.

But this is not the only, nor the most important fact, bearing upon the question of the propriety of such changes.

The "Headings," etc., *first published by the American Bible Society*, in their edition of 1816, afterwards again reproduced by them in 1821, and which continued to be published and circulated by them more or less for fourteen years, down to 1830, were, in many parts, *not conformed at all to either the earlier or the later English Headings*; but were plainly originated on this side of the water, and probably in the printing room of the New York Bible Society. If any fact can prove any principle, this undeniable and demonstrable fact *proves*, beyond all rational doubt or controversy, that the founders and early Managers of the American Bible Society held themselves at liberty to depart from and to improve upon those accessories to the version, which had been invented and modified in England, though the version itself they could not constitutionally alter or amend. Either they were utterly unconscious of what they were doing, and did not read their own Bibles, or else they felt themselves free to amend, for any sufficient reason, the "Headings" and "Contents of Chapters," as well as altogether to omit the other accessories, which had been commonly connected on the other side of the ocean with the text of the Scriptures. This is one of those facts which decides a principle. It never can be explained, without impeaching the intelligence of the Managers and patrons of the Bible Society in the earliest years of its history, or declaring that they did not know their own meaning in the Constitution, or admitting that the Committee on Versions were amply

authorized in their general procedure. It was not economy which induced to this early course ; for the Headings made here were as long as the abridged English headings. The New York Society substituted their own for the others *because they preferred them* ; and this practice, which the American Bible Society adopted from them, and followed without known complaint from any quarter, through the half-generation which succeeded its organization,—the practice of publishing Headings not of columns only, but of chapters, which had been originated here, and which were entirely diverse from those in the English Bibles—properly and plainly fixes the construction of the Constitution itself. Nor is this all.

Since 1830, and up to a very recent date, the Headings in different editions of the Scriptures published by the Society without question or opposition, and with which the Committee on Versions have had no connection, *have been different from each other*—and some of them certainly have been widely different from the Oxford Headings. In an edition of the Testament and Psalms published in 1837, and in another published in 1845, the Headings are *by no means conformed* to the simultaneous or immediately preceding Oxford editions. If they follow any English authority, it is Dr. Blaney ; and they do not follow him exactly. They certainly differ radically and most palpably from those which have been lately claimed to be the *only* ones that the Constitution allows the Society to publish.

It is not necessary to multiply facts of this general class. Those which we have already cited most amply suffice to demonstrate this point : that the “Headings” and “Contents of Chapters,” connected with the version—which “version,” be it remembered, the late Committee and the Board were unanimous in wishing to maintain in its integrity,—have never heretofore been regarded as beyond the reach of emendation. Blaney amended them. The Edinburgh press had for many years amended them. And, what is more pertinent, the first editions published

by the American Bible Society itself, amended or changed them, without hesitation. The only question which the Committee of Versions felt bound to ask, therefore, in regard to them, when proposing their emendations to the Board, was this : "What are the *best Headings*?" "What will fit most closely to the contents of the Sacred Word, and be most truly helpful to those who study and use this Word?" They recommended certain alterations ; with the cordial acquiescence, as they from the first understood, of the Secretaries of the Society, who were accustomed to meet with them, and to take part in their discussions. They did it simply that by such alterations they might honor God's Word more truly, and set that Word before the readers of it in the most engaging and unobscured form. And it never entered their minds, as it certainly did not the minds of the Board, that in this they were transcending the Constitution, or doing more than pursuing the line of numerous safe and justifying precedents. And the more fully and patiently they have considered the matter, the more have they been convinced that their course in this particular was right and was needful.

The principle which they adopted was this :—to make *the Headings a mere index to the evident contents of the Text, expressed in the words of the Text itself.* This principle, in general, certainly, they consistently carried out. And while they have never been tenacious about maintaining all the changes which they thus proposed, and which the Board adopted, it can hardly be doubted by any one who examines the matter, that the great majority of the changes thus made were vastly for the better. Some instances will help to make this apparent ; and they hope that no reader will fail to go carefully through with the comparison. Only one or two specimens, of course, can be selected from each class ; but these will suffice to illustrate the point. To make the comparison more obvious the two are printed, the old and the new, in parallel columns.

1. Headings changed for their CLUMSINESS.

Acts 8. Old Heading.

1 By occasion of the persecution in Jerusalem, the church being planted in Samaria, 5 by Philip the deacon, who preached, did miracles, and baptized many, among the rest Simon the Sorcerer, a great seducer of the people: 14 Peter and John come to confirm and enlarge the Church: where, by prayer and imposition of hands giving the Holy Ghost, 18 when Simon would have bought the like power of them, 20 Peter sharply reproofing his hypocrisy, and covetousness, and exhorting him to repentance, together with John preaching the word of the Lord, return to Jerusalem. 26 But the angel sendeth Philip to teach and baptize the Ethiopian eunuch.

Acts 2. Old Heading.

1 The Apostles, filled with the Holy Ghost, and speaking divers languages, are admired by some, and derided by others. 14 Whom Peter disproving, and shewing that the apostles spake by the power of the Holy Ghost, that Jesus was risen from the dead, ascended into heaven, had poured down the same Holy Ghost, and was the Messias, a man known to them to be approved of God by his miracles, wonders, and signs, and not crucified without his determinate counsel, and foreknowledge: 37 he baptizeth a great number that were converted. 41 Who afterwards devoutly and charitably converse together; the apostles working many miracles, and God daily increasing his church.

New Heading.

The disciples are scattered abroad, and preach the word. 5 Philip preacheth at Samaria. 9 Simon the sorcerer is baptized. 14 Peter and John are sent to Samaria; in answer to whose prayer, and with the laying on of their hands, the Holy Ghost is given. 18 Simon offereth them money for the like power. 20 Peter rebuketh him. 26 Philip is sent to teach and to baptize the Ethiopian eunuch.

New Heading.

The outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, and the gift of tongues. 14 Peter's discourse. 37 Three thousand repent, and are baptized. 44 The disciples have all things common. 47 Converts are daily added to the church.

2 Cor. 10. Old Heading.

1 Against the false apostles, who disgraced the weakness of his person and bodily presence, he setteth out the spiritual might and authority, with which he is armed against all adversary powers, 7 assuring them that at his coming he will be found as mighty in word, as he is now in writing being absent: 12 and withal taxing them for reaching out themselves beyond their compass, and vaunting themselves into other men's labours.

New Heading.

Against those who disparaged his bodily presence and speech, he asserteth his spiritual might and authority; 12 and reproveth them for stretching themselves beyond their measure, and for boasting themselves of other men's labours.

The above three instances illustrate sufficiently one important class of the changes made by the Committee. They were made in Headings which were so cumbrous as to be in many cases almost grotesque, and to overlay and hide, instead of illustrating, the meaning of the text. We pass then to notice another, and certainly a not less important class, of these alterations. They are :

2. Headings changed for their INCOMPLETENESS.

Isaiah 53. Old Heading.

1 The prophet complaining of incredulity, excuseth the scandal of the cross, 4 by the benefit of his (*qu.* whose?) passion, 10 and the good success thereof.

New Heading.

The Messiah despised and rejected. 4 His sufferings in our behalf. 7 His meekness, humiliation, and death. 10 The benefits of his passion.

Psalm 77. Old Heading.

1 The psalmist sheweth what fierce combat he had with diffidence. 10 The victory which he had by consideration of God's great and gracious works.

New Heading.

The psalmist troubled, 7 and tempted to distrust God. 10 He encourageth himself in God by remembering his works of old, 15 and especially his deliverance of Israel.

2 Thess. 1. Old Heading.

1 St. Paul certifieth them of the good opinion which he had of their faith, love, and patience; 11 and therewithal useth divers reasons for the comforting of them in persecution, whereof the chiefeſt is taken from the righteous judgment of God.

1 Tim. 4. Old Heading.

1 He foretelleth that in the latter times there shall be a departure from the faith. 6 And to the end that Timothy might not fail in doing his duty, he furnisheth him with divers precepts belonging thereto.

The above instances are taken almost at random from different parts of the Old and New Testaments, and many more striking ones might be adduced. But these are enough to illustrate clearly another important class of the alterations proposed by the Committee, adopted and published by the Board, and now thrown violently away, because the Board 'has no right to tamper with the Word of God!'-We pass then to a third class:

3. Headings changed, because *COMMENTS*.*Luke 5. Old Heading.*

1 Christ teacheth the people out of Peter's ship: 4 in a miraculous taking of fishes sheweth how he will make him and his partners fishers of men: 12 cleanseth the leper; 16 prayeth in the wilderness; 18 healeth one sick of the palsy: 27 calleth Matthew the publican: 29 eateth with sinners, as being the physician of souls: 34 foretelleth the fastings and afflictions of the apostles after his ascension: 36 and likeneth fainthearted and weak disciples to old bottles and worn garments.

New Heading.

The Salutation. 3 The apostle's thanksgiving to God for their faith, love, and patience in persecution. 6 He consoleth them under trials, in view of the judgment of God; 11 and prayeth that Christ may be glorified in them.

New Heading.

The Spirit speaketh of a departure from the faith in the latter times. 6 Timothy is to put the brethren in remembrance of these things. 8 Godliness is profitable. 12 He is to be an example of the believers.

New Heading.

Jesus teacheth the people. 4 The miraculous draught of fishes. 10 The calling of Peter, James, and John. 12 Jesus cleanseth a leper; 16 prayeth in the wilderness: 18 healeth one sick of the palsy; 27 and calleth Levi: 29 who maketh a feast, at which Jesus eateth with publicans and sinners. 33 He justifieth his disciples in not fasting.

Daniel 11. Old Heading.

1 The overthrow of Persia by the King of Grecia. 5 Leagues and conflicts between the kings of the South and of the North. 30 *The invasion and tyranny of the Romane.*

New Heading.

The overthrow of Persia by the King of Grecia. 5 Leagues and conflicts between the kings of the South and of the North. 21 The rise of a vile person to power. 30 His impious conduct. 40 His fall.

Psalm 49. Old Heading.

1 *An earnest persuasion to build the faith of resurrection, not on worldly power, but on God.* 16 *Worldly prosperity is not to be admired.*

New Heading.

The psalmist calleth upon all men to hear. 6 He sheweth the vanity of trusting in wealth. 16 *Worldly prosperity is not to be envied.*

Sol. Song 8. Old Heading.

1 *The love of the Church to Christ.* 6 The vehemency of love. 8 *The calling of the Gentiles.* 14 *The Church prayeth for Christ's coming.*

New Heading.

The delight of the bride and her beloved in each other. 6 Love strong as death. 8 The bride's desire in behalf of her sister. 14 She longeth for the coming of her beloved.

These again are only a few instances out of numbers that might with equal pertinency be cited. Very few persons are aware, until they examine the matter carefully, how far those particular (and often palpably incorrect) forms of interpretation, which prevailed when Drs. Bilson and Smith prepared their Headings for the First Edition of our revered version, have been incorporated by them in these Headings. Not only the more general forms of interpretation, but their own individual views of certain passages, are thus incorporated; and those two gentlemen now preach to the whole world, so far as the early editions are followed, what often is incorrect sentiment or doctrine, from the pulpit which has been given them at the heads of these chapters. The Committee on Versions adopted the principle of excluding all such comments by drawing their Headings directly from the Text itself, and making them include *only the unquestionable contents of that Text.* In the Headings of the Song of

Solomon, however, they took the word "bride" instead of the word "spouse," because the two are equivalent, while the gender of the word Bride is more unequivocal and instantly apparent, and it is elsewhere in the Scriptures associated more usually and intimately with the Church; is, in fact, the very name which Christ himself gives to the Church, and the symbol under which the beloved and last apostle most lovingly describes it. They say, in regard to this, in their published Report, (already quoted,) "The Committee fully believe, that this poem is intended to symbolize the mystical union between God or Christ and the souls of believers on earth, either individually or collectively; but nothing of this is expressed in the literal language of the text." They felt, therefore, that they honored God most truly, while they strictly obeyed the constitutional requirement, in conforming their Headings more nearly, than before to the *very language of the inspired Word itself*. Any objection which is made to such Headings is really made against the wisdom of Him who is the inspiring Author, as He is the great ever-living Preserver, of the Scriptures themselves.

We pass then to the last class of changes which requires to be noticed. They are :

4. Headings changed for their FALSENESS.

Daniel 8. Old Heading.

1 Daniel's vision of the ram and he-goat. 13 *The two thousand and three hundred days of sacrifice.* 15 Gabriel comforteth Daniel, and interpreteth the vision.

New Heading.

Daniel's vision of the ram and he-goat. 13 *The sanctuary to be trodden down two thousand three hundred days.* 15 Gabriel interpreteth the vision to Daniel.

Zeck. 12. Old Heading.

1 Jerusalem a cup of trembling to herself, 3 and a burdensome stone to her adversaries. 6 The victorious restoring of Judah. 9 The repentance of Jerusalem.

New Heading.

Jerusalem a cup of trembling and a burdensome stone to her adversaries; etc. [The text is: "I will make Jerusalem a cup of trembling unto all the people round about," &c.]

1 Sam. 16. Old Heading.

1 Samuel sent by God, *under pretense of a sacrifice*, cometh to Bethlehem. 6 His human judgment is reprobated. 13 He anointeth David. 19 Saul sendeth for David to quiet his evil spirit.

New Heading.

Samuel sent to Bethlehem to anoint one of the sons of Jesse. 6 Seven of his sons pass before Samuel. 12 David is chosen, and anointed. 14 Saul, troubled by an evil spirit, sendeth for David.

Isaiah 41. Old Heading.

1 God expostulateth with his people, about his mercies to the church, 10 about his promises, 21 and about the vanity of idols.

New Heading.

God calleth upon *idolaters* to consider his power to aid his people. 8 His gracious assurance to Israel of protection. 21 The vanity of idols.

Ezekiel 18. Old Heading.

1 God reproveth the unjust parable of sour grapes; etc.

New Heading.

God reproveth the people for their unjust proverb of the sour grapes etc.

Numbers 21. Old Heading.

1 Israel with some loss destroy the Canaanites at Hormah. 4 The people murmuring are plagued with fiery serpents. 7 They repenting are healed by a brazen serpent; etc.

New Heading.

Israel destroy the Canaanites at Hormah. 4 The people murmur, and are plagued with fiery serpents. 7 They repent, and are healed in looking upon the brazen serpent; etc.

Other similar instances might be given, where the old Headings state what is distinctly and positively *not true*; and what is expressly, in so many words, contradicted by the text; while the new ones are carefully and uniformly conformed to this. But it cannot be needful to multiply these further. A single instance of this class illustrates the principle as well as fifty. It is certainly not a point which requires to be proved, in this age of the world, that any Christian Society which feels itself constrained to publish what it knows to be *untrue*, as a permanent exposition of the meaning of God's most holy Word, must ere long change its Constitution, or cease to exist. Fortunately,

the American Bible Society is not shut up, by its organic law, to such an alternative. It may change these Headings, legally, constitutionally, whenever it sees fit to exercise its just powers.

It must be understood, distinctly, that the Committee on Versions did not maintain that the Headings which they had suggested, and which the Board had adopted, were in all respects the best possible ; were not susceptible of any further improvement. They were perfectly ready to revise them still further, and to call in the help of the most wise and careful Biblical scholars to aid them in this revision. They only contended that what Drs. Bilson and Smith did without dissent in their day, though as far as appears without any special authority from anybody—what Blaney did after them—and what the editors of the first editions of the Scriptures published by the American Bible Society freely did—this the Board, and its agents, should now be at liberty to do, more carefully and more accurately ; and they were willing to assist in this work.

In reviewing at this day this part of their work, while they see some things which they would cheerfully amend, they are confident that the ultimate verdict must be, both of enlightened scholars and of unlearned readers, that what they did was not only needed, but was in the main carefully and well done ; that the contents of the version were better and more clearly represented in the Headings than they had before been. If this is so, their work, in their judgment, needs no other vindication.

**ACTION OF THE BOARD OF MANAGERS, AND THE OFFICERS
OF THE SOCIETY, IN REGARD TO THE STANDARD EDITION
THUS PREPARED.**

The Report of the Committee on Versions, from which extracts have been previously given, was unanimously adopted, as we have said, by the Board of Managers, in May, 1851 ; and was ordered to be published, for the information of all members and friends of the Society. The Resolutions with which the

Report closed were also adopted, and the necessary measures were immediately taken to have them carried into full effect, and to have copies of the Scriptures prepared in accordance with them. Extracts from the Report, covering nearly ten closely printed octavo pages, were incorporated by the Senior Secretary of the Society, Rev. Dr. Brigham, in the Annual Report of 1852 ; the last paragraph, especially, with all its array of capitals and italics, being thus reproduced by him a year after the original Report had been made and adopted, and after the Bibles prepared accordingly were fully before himself and his colleagues, and the Christian public.

Still later, in 1856, after the Standard Edition had been out for several years, and had been systematically and earnestly circulated in all parts of the land, a Resolution was adopted by the Board presenting copies of it to eminent citizens of our own country, and even to sovereigns in Europe and elsewhere, accompanied by laudatory letters, signed by the President, but understood to have been written by the Secretary, Dr. Brigham, from one of which (to Queen Victoria) the following is an extract :

To Her Gracious Majesty, Victoria, Queen of Great Britain and Ireland.

MOST HONOURED SOVEREIGN :—The Managers of the American Bible Society, having recently collated the English Bible in their use, with the first edition of King James of 1611, and also with the more recent issues of the authorized presses of England, beg leave respectfully to present your Majesty with a copy thus prepared. *They believe it to be an unusually correct edition of that incomparable version.*

This letter was dated Dec. 31, 1856. The other copies were sent, most of them at least, still later than this, and some of them certainly after the attacks on the Standard Edition had brought its peculiarities anew and prominently before the Board and the Christian Public. Similar testimonies of respect, and admiration for the Standard Edition were frequently given by auxiliaries of the Society, as well as by private purchasers and readers of the Bible, and throughout the whole of these six

years, succeeding the completion of the work, and the publication of the Report, there seemed to be but one sentiment anywhere concerning it.

The Committee saw, with a pleasure which they need not disguise, their work, the result of so much labor and care, accepted with such cordial approbation and pleasure, not only by the Managers, but by very many others whose judgment was to them of highest value, as well as by the great body of unlettered readers of the Bible, whom they had had chiefly in view in preparing the edition, and to whom they had hoped and earnestly prayed to be able to make it most truly useful. They felt that they had in this an ample reward for all the time and pains they had expended ; and they cherished the anticipation that after they themselves should have gone to their rest, the fruit of their long and arduous work would still be instructing and blessing multitudes of their countrymen in all parts of the land, and in all walks of life ; of those, indeed, in every land, who "know the joyful sound" of the ancient and honored English version of the Scriptures. To maintain this "version" in its finished integrity, while carefully perfecting it in the manner of its imprint, and furnishing it with such accessories as should let its majestic and consecrated harmonies ring clearly out, without clashing against obsolete and incorrect indexes, or discordant comments—this was their sole desire and aim !

OPPOSITION TO THE STANDARD EDITION OF THE SCRIPTURES THUS PREPARED AND APPROVED.

The first attack on the Standard Edition of the Scriptures thus prepared and adopted, eulogized by the Board and the Senior Secretary, everywhere distributed, and accepted and studied without dissent, was made by the Rev. A. C. Coxe of Baltimore, a minister of the Protestant Episcopal church, not himself a member of the Society, nor a contributor to its funds. In January, 1857, a handsomely printed pamphlet was pub-

lished by him, the tone and drift of which will sufficiently appear from the following extracts, taken almost at random from different parts of it :

“That any man—or set of men,—however respectable in their spheres of private usefulness, should propose themselves as the competent emendators of such a standard, or dream of producing a Bible for common use, that should unite the suffrages of their fellow Christians, and *supersede the time-honored version in its integrity*, would seem to prove that nothing is too holy for the hand of rash innovation, or too high for the adventure of presumptuous experiment :

“As if Religion were intended,
For nothing else but to be mended !”

Refined gold must be gilded, and the lily painted ; and if possible, the very lights of heaven would be tinkered and repaired, by the wild conceit of the times ; but to see good and pious men touched with the same enthusiasm which infects the unthinking and irreligious, is indeed deplorable. How melancholy the exhibition which the worthy, but mistaken, projectors of the ‘New Baptist Version,’ have made of themselves and their cause ; and how sad the spectacle presented by the ‘American Bible Society,’ *in its half-way adventure towards the same conclusion !*”

* * * * *

“For more than thirty years the Society is said to have celebrated its great anniversary festivals, in the presence of hundreds of professed ministers of CHRIST, without a prayer for his blessing, or an ascription to the glory of the Holy Trinity ; and that, confessedly, on the ground of the radical differences among its constituents as to the very nature of God, and the proper manner of invoking His adorable name. * * Can such an association be a safe ‘witness and keeper of Holy Writ ?’ It has answered the question, by making itself *a manufacturer of alloy, and debasing the very standard it is pledged to circulate in its integrity*. It already circulates a Bible which justifies the worst ‘prophecies which went before on it,’ from the lips of Bishop Hobart ; and yet no one can examine this new standard, and the principles on which it has been produced, without seeing that, if once admitted, it must prove the precursor of changes the most thorough, and the most fatal to orthodoxy. * * * Should it become the Bible of the American people, a cold, modernized, and (to the man of feeling) a *vulgarized* work, will have supplanted the Bible which we have known from childhood, and which has made so many ‘wise unto salvation.’”

* * * * *

“It is the tendency of all human institutions to corrupt themselves, especially when they have begun to be rich. The American Bible Society, in

its new palace, and surrounded by the excitement of the great moneyed mart of this hemisphere, waxes fat, like Jeshurun, and like him, begins to kick. Its strength would have been to sit still. If it could have resisted the temptation to do something more than was given it to do, no one would have ventured to inquire as to the propriety of its joining house to house, and multiplying its presses, and diversifying its operations. True, its constitution says nothing about all this; but then the good-natured public supposes all this to be necessary to the *circulating* of the Holy Scriptures, and possibly it is so. But the possession of such facilities for original work, is a great stimulant to the undertaking of large enterprises. That such a Body should be content to circulate a Bible conformed to any standard 'in common use,' seems beneath its dignity. A modest experiment is resolved on, which grows less modest as it proceeds."

* * * * *

"I submit it to the judgment of devout and reasonable men, whether, at any time, the intrusion of such novelties into a standard, on mere individual responsibility, is not most dangerous. But if at any time, more especially at this time, when a great portion of our country is witness to the most alarming theological progress towards the Rationalism of Germany. In New England, all things denote the advance of a thoroughly unevangelical spirit, which has possessed itself of the chief seats of learning, and which is successfully contending with the few old-fashioned representatives of a superior orthodoxy, that are left among the descendants of the Puritans. If the evil spirit has been exorcised from its German haunts, it is evident that it is seeking rest in America!"

The violent assaults of which we have given some specimens above, especially as taken in connection with the intimation, more than once repeated in the pamphlet, that the Committee or its collator had *made* 24,000 changes in the Text of the Scriptures—the fact being, as stated in their Report, that they had *found* 24,000 variations, mostly in punctuation, in the copies *previously circulated* in Great Britain or America—were well adapted, of course, to arouse suspicion and hostility against the new Standard Edition. Auxiliaries of the Society began to be alarmed; and some who had themselves been using the revised edition for years without discovering errors or defects in it, became conscientiously excited, lest the Society should suddenly rush into the work of "debasing the standard," and deluge the land

with copies of some new "neological Bible!" In the May following, (1857,) the subject came up for discussion in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, (Old School,) and the tone of some of the more prominent debaters was violently hostile to the action of the Society; one speaker,—who has since, on several occasions, denounced the work of the Committee as a "murdering of the Bible," a "rationalistic butchery" of the revered and consecrated version,—being greatly excited on the subject, and aiding largely to excite and alarm those who heard him.

From that time onward the movement to reverse and cancel what the Committee had so carefully and patiently done, and what the Board of Managers had so cordially and unanimously accepted and approved, and what the Christian Public had so generally and gladly availed itself of, went on with increasing vigor and animation. It was helped by one of our oldest and ablest theological Reviews in an elaborate Editorial article, containing many misstatements of fact, unintentional no doubt, with much plausible reasoning, and vigorous rhetoric. It was yielded to, at length, by the Senior Secretary of the Society, who up to August of that year had consistently expressed himself, in public and in private, as satisfied and happy in what had been done. And at length, in January, 1858, it was brought to its consummation, as our readers are aware, by the vote of the Board of Managers, reversing their former action, and deciding to expunge, both in the Text and in the accessories, whatever was not in some previous editions.

Upon the adoption of this measure, in connection with minor measures to be noticed more particularly hereafter, which seemed especially unjust to the Committee, six of the seven members of this Committee, without any previous concert or plan, resigned the places they had till then occupied, to give way to others who could carry out more cordially and effectually the revolutionary course thus resolved upon. Their resignations were accepted; and their common responsibilities, in connection with

the recent Standard Edition, are therefore terminated with the publication of this pamphlet.

With these preliminary remarks, which have seemed necessary to a proper understanding of the documents which follow, the late members of the Committee on Versions proceed to lay those documents before the readers of this pamphlet. For the sake of greater clearness, they are arranged in chronological order. The first is the Report presented to the Board of Managers by Dr. Vermilye, on behalf of the Committee on Versions, to whom certain memorials, etc., had been referred. It was agreed to by all the Committee, after having been twice read before them, and was presented to the Board, Nov. 12th, 1857:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON VERSIONS.

The Committee on Versions, who were directed by this Board to consider the objections made to our Standard Edition of the Bible, and to suggest such action as may be desirable, respectfully report :

That they took the subject into immediate consideration, but during the summer months their meetings were necessarily suspended. Since the return of members to the city, they have held numerous and protracted meetings, at most of which all the members of the Committee were present ; and as the result of their deliberations and inquiries, they present the following preamble and resolutions for the consideration of the Board.

The final report of the Committee on the subject of the revision was adopted on the first of May, 1851. For the three and a half years preceding, it had been matter of public notoriety, that under the direction of the Board, the Committee on Versions, and a sub-committee and collator, were occupied with this work ; it had been frequently adverted to in the public journals, and distinctly specified in the annual reports. And when the final report was printed, it was circulated diligently in every direction, and special efforts were made to draw attention to its contents, and obtain an expression of public sentiment on the subject. During the entire period that elapsed from the beginning of the work down to this very year, a period of nearly nine years, for full six years of which the report and the revised Bibles have been in the hands of the community, no word of objection against the enterprise itself, on the ground that the Board or the Committee had transcended their legitimate bounds—none, to the manner in which the work had been done—has ever been heard. But many words of approbation and pleasure we have heard ; accompanied at times with regrets that, while engaged, we had not felt at

liberty to proceed farther, and correct other things which still remain as blemishes on the pages of our common Bibles. The Board and the Committee had good reason, therefore, to conclude that their constituents were well satisfied with the fruits of their labors; and to indulge a feeling of heartfelt gratification, that under the favor of a kind Providence they had been enabled, to the extent to which they had gone in this revision, to accomplish an object which many friends of the Bible had felt to be desirable. Recently, however, the subject has been taken up with warmth; misconceptions and misstatements of the real facts have become current; and as the very natural result, much uneasiness has been felt in various quarters.

We hope and believe, however, that the discussions which have been held before public bodies, and through the religious and secular journals, have tended to throw light on the matter, and greatly to relieve the honest fears of many of the patrons of the Society.

Besides the suggestions made to the Board in April last, by the respected delegates of the Maryland Society, the Committee have had before them a memorial from the Philadelphia Bible Society; and the candor and kindness of tone displayed by these esteemed brethren, deserve our thanks, even though we may not be able to accord with them in all their conclusions. The Committee have sought from other sources, also, to obtain a correct knowledge of the opinions entertained on the subject; and they are led to believe that a very large proportion of the friends of the Society are satisfied with what has been done, and desire no change. Others, while commanding the design, express doubts or disapprobation of separate parts, and desire some alteration in details of the work; while another portion object to the whole, deny altogether the right of the Board or the Society in the premises, and seem to claim that by the first article of the constitution the Society is forever precluded from making any attempt, by revision either of the text or accessories, to produce such a corrected Standard as we have prepared. This extreme opinion, your committee are persuaded, finds no support in the article of the constitution referred to; it will impose a restriction upon the publishing of the Bible, unreasonable in itself, and such as the whole history of Bible printing shows has never been adopted; it is contrary to what has been formerly done by this Board; will place the Society in a position where it cannot correct obvious errors and defects, and thus greatly disparage its issues in the common estimation, and do injury to the Bible.

The constitution requires the Society to circulate only "the version in common use." "The version in common use," without dispute, means King James' translation. The Society may not print or circulate any other English translation. But no one can reasonably pretend that by this article the Society has precluded itself from the common-sense right, by careful collation and revision, of making their issues of this version as perfect as possible.

The Board on a former occasion directed such revision; and in Great Britain, likewise, "the version in common use" has from time to time been subjected to the like process. Nay, we may add that changes in words and phrases in the text itself have been made by unknown hands since the translators finished their labors; and many such changes have brought King James' Bible to its present state, but surely have not destroyed "the version in common use." Although this Board has no authority to make any such alterations, and none we believe would desire it, yet we can discover no principle or expediency that will require or justify them in perpetuating known errors, or forbid the effort to obtain as correct a text as possible of King James' translation. In regard to the text, that was what the Committee aimed to do. And so far as we can gather the prevailing sentiment, we believe it to be, that the text, upon which so much time and labor have been bestowed, may very safely stand as the Committee have given it. Indeed, it is a matter of sincere gratification, amidst all the pain we have experienced, to hear the respected objectors themselves say of whatever changes we have made in the text, that "they are few in number, of minor importance, and all for the better;" that "they leave the English Bible substantially in its integrity; not one reader in a thousand would notice them, unless they were pointed out." And some of them have distinctly and candidly admitted, as we understand them, that in their opinion, our standard edition for the text is the best extant.

With regard to the accessories of the text the case is different. They not only are of mere human authority, but beyond dispute, with acknowledged excellencies, many of them are open to grave objections. These considerations alone, we conceive, might justify an effort to improve them. There would be no tampering with the Word of God by so doing, for they are the mere work of man; nor would it be altering the version, which is the transference of words or ideas from one language into words of like signification in another, for they make no part of the original. Moreover, this Board, by former action, and even the original founders and managers of the Society, who surely must have understood what powers were intended to be conferred or restrained by the constitution they themselves made, have interpreted it to mean this; for they inserted or altogether omitted the appendages, which they could not have done if they thought them part of the version; and they have employed different ones at different times, as an inspection of their several editions will demonstrate. The same thing is true of the English and Scotch editions, printed under governmental authority. They vary in these points, yet are all of the "version in common use." It cannot, therefore, as we conceive, be justly claimed, either from the terms of the constitution, or their own former unimpeached action, that the Managers are required to use the accessories at all, or any one class of them, although they may of late have mostly used the old.

But when it is remembered that the old headings of chapters, the changes from which seem now the chief point objected against, are full of comment, while the first article of the constitution says, the Society shall print "without note or comment," and that the Committee aimed, by substituting very extensively the very words of the text, to obviate this objection, we must hold the intention to be right, as we maintain that no constitutional restriction has been violated by what has been done. The Committee deem it important, moreover, that the Board shall not lose sight of these facts and principles; nor for a temporary convenience adopt a course of action, or establish principles, which may greatly embarrass themselves and their successors, and impair the ability of this Society to do its important work in the best manner, by making its Bibles as correct and perfect in all respects as possible.

While, however, the Committee maintain these views, it certainly becomes them to pay the utmost deference to the opinions of the patrons and friends of the Society, as to the manner in which our revision has been executed; and to be willing, as they think they are, to recommend any reasonable course that will satisfy and remove scruples, and not infringe upon principles hitherto upheld and of practical importance. All suggestions, however, cannot be adopted, for they are conflicting. We may surely hope, after the strong testimony we have quoted, to prove that we have not vitiated nor despoiled the text,—that the old English Bible, King James' translation, the version in common use, is still given by the Society "in its integrity," with such corrections only as are "for the better,"— that that portion of the work will be accepted with candor; the more, as we distinctly deny the right of this Society to make any new English translation, and disclaim every wish and intention of the kind. The new Headings of the Chapters seem now to be the main subject of difficulty. And since some are grieved that in the application of the principle adopted by the Committee to avoid comment, they have seemed to interfere with the Christology of the Old Testament, by the use of Old Testament titles for Christ and the Church instead of those transferred from the New, we would, for the sake of peace, yield our own opinions on that subject, and make distinct recognition of those great names; for example, in prominent parts of the Prophets, and at the beginning of the Canticles. Other improvements of these Headings would no doubt suggest themselves, upon a careful revision, which might possibly make them more acceptable to all parties. We by no means claim that they are perfect. Should this suggestion meet the approval of the Board, the Committee will willingly undergo the labor, in the sincere hope that this spirit, and the result of such a revision, will tend to increase and perpetuate the confidence and affection of all towards this great, catholic Institution.

In accordance with the sentiments above expressed, the Committee respectfully recommend to the Board the adoption of the following Resolutions:

RESOLUTIONS ACCOMPANYING DR. VERMILYE'S REPORT.

1. That it is the business of the American Bible Society, represented by this Board, to publish in English the version of the Bible known as King James' version, as translated out of the original Hebrew and Greek; with such obvious corrections as have been made in the lapse of two and a half centuries, whether from a comparison of the Hebrew and Greek originals, or from the general progress of the English tongue.

For *Corrections*, see an article in the *N. Y. Observer* of Sept. 17th, and *Protestant Churchman*, of October 3d.

For *Orthography*, see *English Bibles*.

2. That inasmuch as various readings exist in the different editions and copies of the said English version, this Board possess, and have always exercised the right, which has been commonly exercised when new editions were to be prepared, to collate said varying editions and copies, and to select, for their own standard, such readings as may seem, on good grounds, to be the best.

See *Bush's Collation* in 1836-8.

Compare *Blaney's Collation and Report*. The *Trenton edition*, etc.

3. That in regard to the *accessories* of the text, comprising Headings of Columns and Chapters, Marginal Readings and Notes, and Marginal References, none of which exist in the Hebrew and Greek originals, this Board possess, and have always exercised the right, either to omit them altogether, or to insert them in part, or so to modify them as may seem best adapted to render them more useful.

See the Society's first edition, and also subsequent ones, the smaller sizes; and the *Scotch Bible*. Compare *Blaney's Report*, etc.

4. That in preparing their present Standard copy, neither this Board, nor the Committee on Versions, have introduced any new principle or practice, but have acted only in accordance with what has been done repeatedly by the authorized Bible printing-houses in England and Scotland, and also by this Board itself in former years.

See *Blaney's Report and Edition*; also *Editions of 1806, 1813, 1836, etc.*

Compare *Bush's Collation*, and the *Bibles of smaller sizes*.

5. *Resolved*, That the Committee on Versions be authorized and requested to revise the Headings of Chapters in our new Standard Edition, and report to this Board what alterations can be made so as to bring them into greater conformity with the suggestions in the close of the above report.

All which is respectfully submitted.

By Order of the Committee.

The foregoing Resolutions not being found acceptable to the

majority of the Board of Managers, the whole subject was, after discussion, referred back to the Committee of Versions for further consideration ; and at a subsequent meeting of the Board (Nov. 19) the subjoined Resolutions were presented by Dr. Vermilye, in behalf of a portion of the Committee. These, also, were not adopted ; and, after further discussion, the subject was recommitted to a SPECIAL COMMITTEE of Nine. These Resolutions, presented by Dr. Vermilye, are here inserted however, as necessary to complete the historical chain of documents.

1. *Resolved*, That in the opinion of this Board, the Society, under its Constitution, can print and circulate in English only King James' translation of the Sacred Scriptures ;—yet they possess, and have heretofore always exercised, in common with the Bible publishing-houses in England and Scotland, the power of collating the original translation, and other approved editions of subsequent years, and of doing what may be necessary for the purpose of rectifying errors, and obtaining a correct text of that version.

2. Inasmuch as the recent collation is thought in some few instances to have exceeded the proper application of this principle : *Resolved*, that the Committee on Versions be requested carefully to revise their work, and wherever a word has been inserted or substituted, or where the punctuation has been altered, without the authority of any former edition, to conform our Standard in those instances to what exists in the translation, or in one or more of the subsequent approved copies.

3. The Headings of Chapters, with the other appendages of the text, being of mere human authority, neither this Society nor the Bible publishing-houses in England and Scotland have ever felt bound, as their practice shows, either always to use them, or to adhere to any one unvarying form of them. They were not the work of all the translators ; and have been altered, in manifold instances, by unknown hands, from time to time. Yet, since many of the friends of the Society object to the changes that have been made in our Standard Edition, especially in the Old Testament headings of chapters, on the ground that by the removal of New Testament and the substitution of Old Testament terms, the christology of the Old Testament is obscured, and desire that this feature of the former headings be preserved :

Resolved, That the Committee be requested to revise that portion of their work also, and to restore the words "Christ" and "the Church" in prominent places in the Prophets, and in the beginning of Canticles, and where it may be desirable in the Old Testament ; and, in general, to revise the Head-

ings of Chapters, both in the Old and New Testament, with the purpose of bringing them into as near conformity with what has heretofore existed in the approved editions in common use as may be, while avoiding as far as possible all "note or comment."

[An extended discussion, in which many of the Managers and Life-Directors present participated, followed the reading of the above Resolutions. A carefully prepared paper was also presented by Rev. Dr. Turner, discussing the points covered by the Resolutions. This paper, with an additional statement from the author completing it, will be found in the Appendix, document A.]

As before stated, on the failure of the Board to adopt either of the preceding series of resolutions, the whole subject was committed to a Special Committee of Nine, the members of which were to be appointed by the Vice-Presidents of the Society then present and officiating. This Committee, as finally constituted, consisted of the following gentlemen :

Rev. R. S. STORRS, Jr., D. D., *Chairman.*
 " THOMAS DEWITT, D. D.,
 " G. T. BEDELL, D.D.,
 Hon. B. F. BUTLER, LL. D.,
 Rev. H. A. BOARDMAN, D. D.,
 Rt. Rev. Bishop JAMES, D. D.,
 Rev. JOHN MCLEOD, D. D.,
 JAMES LENOX, Esq.,
 CHARLES TRACY, Esq.

This Committee, after having had several sessions, on the 14th January presented to the Board, at an adjourned meeting, the following Reports. The Majority Report, drawn up and read by Charles Tracy, Esq., was not signed by any member of the Committee. The resolutions accompanying it were verbally agreed to, however, by most of the members of the Committee ; and, so far, it may with propriety be called the Majority Report. A searching though brief review of this entire paper will be found in the Appendix to this pamphlet, document C.

MAJORITY REPORT.

To the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society :

The Committee to which was referred, by your resolution of 19th November, 1857, the whole subject of the Society's Standard English Bible, and the questions relating thereto, respectfully report:

That your Committee have had several meetings, and have considered the matters so referred, and the following is the result of their deliberations :

The present standard Bible of the Society was first printed in 1851, being edited according to the revision which was commenced in 1847 and completed in 1851. The objections to this standard Bible proceed from such sources, among the members and friends of the Society, as entitle them to great respect. The substance of the objections is, that in the revision alterations have been made, in both the text and the accessories of the text, which are not authorized by this Society's previous editions, nor by other Bibles in common use, and that the present standard Bible is not warranted by the Constitution, nor admissible among the publications of the Society.

In reference to the text:—your Committee find that a very few changes have been made in the words of the text; and a few alterations have been made in the sense of the text by changes in punctuation, (including brackets and parentheses,) and changes in orthography, and in the use or disuse of capitals and italics. All these several changes, in the judgment of your Committee, are a departure from the principle which should govern the Society. The Constitution, formed in 1816, by its first article provides that "the sole object" of the Society "shall be to encourage a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures, without note or comment. The only copies in the English language, to be circulated by the Society, shall be of the version now in common use." The Bibles then in common use in this country were partly from the authorized presses of London, Oxford, Cambridge, or Edinburgh, and partly from the presses of private publishers in the United States, or of local Bible Societies in this country. All such Bibles, typographical errors of course excepted, were, it is believed, uniform in the words of the text, and exhibited slight if any differences in respect of capitals, italics, and punctuation; and they corresponded substantially with the original edition of King James' translators, published in 1611. In all parts of the text, the determination of what the true reading is should be made by a comparison of copies; and a return to that reading, in all cases of deviation from it, is clearly necessary. The Society has no charter to exercise criticism on the translation, nor to adopt any change in the version upon grounds ever so obvious to its managers or committees; but it must confine itself strictly to the great trust committed to its charge by the Constitution.

The accessories of the text consist of the summaries of contents or headings of the chapters, the headings of the columns, the references, and the marginal readings. These were contained in the first edition of the translators, were amended in the authorized Oxford edition of 1769, and have continued, with some modifications, in the Bibles printed at the authorized British presses to the present time, and circulated for the last half century by the British and Foreign Bible Society.

At the formation of this Society, the Bibles in common use in this country, including those of American and of foreign publication, presented a diversity in respect of such accessories, in this particular: some of them contained the accessories in full, others lacked the references and the marginal readings, and some contained brief headings of chapters, and some contained no headings at all. The brief headings of chapters, when used, were abridgments of the full headings, and conformed to the character and style of the full headings. As a general thing, the larger and higher-priced Bibles contained the accessories in full, in accordance with the authorized English copies, and the Bibles with abridged headings, or with no headings, were of the cheaper or smaller sort.

Immediately before the formation of this Society, the local Bible Societies at New York and at Philadelphia had commenced the publication of Bibles, and had procured plates for the same, and the Bibles from both those local societies exhibit full or abbreviated headings of the chapters; the abbreviated headings of one edition of the New York Bible Society, of 1816, showing variations from all previous copies the Committee have seen, and also containing some of the English headings in an abridged form. This Society commenced its work by printing upon plates furnished by the New York Bible Society, and continued to issue Bibles from such plates for some years thereafter. In 1818, this Society printed a Bible without any headings, except at the tops of the pages; and in 1821 it printed one with the headings of chapters corresponding substantially to the New York Bible Society's edition of 1816, before referred to.

The practice of this Society, from its foundation until the year 1851, when the present standard Bible was printed, had uniformly been to circulate Bibles prepared in the three modes:—with full headings, with brief headings, and with no headings—adopting the two latter modes only in the cheaper or smaller copies, and then for the purpose wholly or chiefly of lessening the cost of the book; but it had not intentionally made changes in the headings, or introduced any new ones.

Your Committee think that the practice of the Society in that respect was conformable to the letter and spirit of the Constitution, and that it established a practical construction of the Constitution itself.

The present standard edition is found not to conform fully to that prac-

tice ; inasmuch as many of the headings of chapters are changed by alterations of language affecting the sense, or by omissions of parts of the matter of the headings, or by inserting new matter. The propriety of any of these changes, in themselves considered, your Committee do not deem a subject for the Society's consideration ; since obedience to its Constitution, and a just deference to the expressed wishes of its friends, require a restoration of the former practice in this behalf.

The revision of the Bible, which was commenced in 1847 and resulted in the present standard edition in 1851, was called for by the necessity and propriety of the case. The inevitable errors of the press having accumulated by the printing of so many previous editions of the Bible, it had become difficult and perplexing for the proof-readers to determine, in many places, which copy was correct, and it was necessary to procure a careful revision of the whole book by a collation of the most accurate editions, and the editing of a new edition according to such revision which might serve as a standard. The errors or discrepancies then existing were typographical only, and were not so serious as to forbid the circulation of Bibles containing them ; but the Society was fairly bound to remove all such blemishes and make its Bibles as perfect as possible. The important and onerous work of collation and revision was confided by your Board to an appropriate Committee, composed of men justly eminent for ability, learning, experience, and piety, and holding high rank in their several different denominations of Christians ; and your Committee both heartily commend the diligence, skill, and fidelity of those good men, and of the collator employed by them, in the performance of their duties, and highly prize the result of their operations as a collation of the Scriptures. But grave objections have been made to the edition thus prepared ; and your Committee, after a careful consideration of these objections, are constrained to say that some of them are, in their judgment, well founded. This being the case, they are clearly of the opinion that the same principle which prompted a collation in 1847, and led to the preparation of the present standard edition, now requires that the Society shall so revise this edition as to remove all just ground of complaint.

Your Committee therefore recommended the adoption by your Board of the following resolutions, viz. :

Resolved, That this Society's present standard English Bible, be referred to the Standing Committee on Versions for examination ; and in all cases where the same differs, in the text or its accessories, from the Bibles previously published by the Society, the Committee are directed to correct the same by conforming it to previous editions printed by this Society, or by the authorized British presses, reference also being had to the original edition of the translators printed in 1611 ; and to report such corrections to this

Board, to the end that a new edition thus perfected, may be adopted as the standard edition of this Society.

Resolved, That until the completion and adoption of such new standard edition, the English Bibles to be issued by this Society shall be such as conform to the editions of the Society anterior to the late revision, so far as may be practicable, and excepting cases where the persons or Auxiliaries applying for Bibles shall prefer to be supplied from copies of the present Standard Edition now on hand or in process of manufacture.

All which is respectfully submitted.

Dated New York, Jan. 14th, 1858.

Immediately after the reading of the above Report, the Rev. Dr. Storrs presented the following Minority Report, drawn up and signed by himself, with the accompanying resolutions :—

MINORITY REPORT, PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF MANAGERS OF THE BIBLE SOCIETY.

In October, 1847, the Committee on Versions, one of the Standing Committees of this Board, were directed by the Board to have prepared under their supervision a Standard Edition of the Holy Scriptures, as circulated by this Society in the English language. In February, 1848, the Committee entered upon this work ; and they prosecuted it diligently from that time onward, till May, 1851, when they reported to the Board that their work was accomplished, and detailed the principles upon which it had been conducted. Their Report was accepted, and ordered to be printed ; and the copy of the Bible prepared by them was adopted as the Standard Copy of this Society, to which all future editions published by it should be conformed.

The editions thus prepared, thus adopted, and thus afterward published, have been ever since in use by the Society ; going everywhere, until within a few months past without known dissent, wherever the Holy Scriptures in English, as distributed by this Society, have been accustomed to circulate.

Objections, however, have recently been presented against these editions. And to consider these objections, with the proper course of the Society in view of them,—and more particularly the proper course of this Board of Managers, who are appointed “to conduct the business of the Society,”—this Committee has been appointed.

The objections concern both the Text of the Bible, as prepared, adopted, and set forth by the Board, and those Accessories which are connected with this. They are presented by individuals, by ecclesiastical bodies, and by auxiliaries of the Society. And as well for the high respectability of their

sources, as for their earnestness, and their intrinsic importance, they demand a careful and serious attention. Not with any disposition to maintain a position, or to carry a measure, but with a sincere and earnest desire to ascertain the truth, and so to exhibit it that others shall accept it, I would consider the subject which they present.

In considering this, it is necessary in the first place, and above all things else, to ascertain the true meaning and scope of those provisions embraced in our Constitution which have a bearing upon this subject.

The first article of the Constitution of this Society is as follows :

"This Society shall be known by the name of the American Bible Society, of which the sole object shall be, to encourage a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures, without note or comment. The only copies in the English language to be circulated by the Society, shall be of the version now in common use."

This article, which defines the object of this Society, and by what means that object shall be accomplished, as all admit, is of binding authority. Not only the just requisitions of the Law, but the claims of Morality and Religion upon us, our obligations to God, as well as to the interests of this Institution, require us to construe it properly, fully, and not to depart from its meaning and intent. Whatever its meaning may be ascertained to be, that must be, until the Constitution shall be changed, our final law in the matters now considered.

The principles of Interpretation, by the application of which this meaning shall be ascertained, are also obvious, and must commend themselves to all.

In the First place, the language employed in the article is to be interpreted naturally and strictly, according to its usual purport and extent.—This is the general rule of the Law, and is obviously correct. It is perfectly applicable in the case of this instrument, because the language employed in it was adopted deliberately, by wise and careful men, who were skilful and practised in the use of words; it was adopted by them, too, after both general and particular discussion.

Secondly, this article must so be interpreted that all its provisions shall harmonize with each other.—An interpretation which brings two clauses of an instrument into direct and palpable collision, especially when those clauses are immediately conjoined, cannot be accepted; least of all, if there be another interpretation, more exactly corresponding with the force of the terms in their usual acceptation, which entirely removes and reconciles such collision, and makes the article harmonious throughout. This, which is also a rule of the Law, is equally a maxim of common sense and right reason.

Thirdly, the article must so be interpreted, under subordination to the preceding rules, that the proper scope of the design of its framers shall be recognized in it.—If they designed to make a Constitution for a permanent Society, and one which, in its main article at least, should not need to

be amended, it is reasonable to infer that that interpretation of their words is the true one which allows most scope for a normal development. We may not violate the usual and accredited meaning of terms, in order to establish such an interpretation. But between two meanings, either of which is possible, and both of which find arguments to support them, other things being equal, that is to be preferred which is best adapted to the future and long-continued working of the Society. This no one will doubt.

To these principles I add, that present parole testimony as to what was intended by this language when adopted, cannot be accepted as a guide in its interpretation:—since, first, what one man, or five, may now think in regard to its meaning, they might not have thought forty-two years ago. They cannot themselves say how far their views have been secretly affected, by intervening events, and by the recent discussions. And, secondly, even if we could ascertain, with certainty and precision, what they then thought, this might not have been the conception or judgment of the whole body of Sixty; and we have no right to assume it as such. The subsequent testimony of individual legislators, as to what was intended by the terms of a statute, if admissible at all, as in Law it is not, is always to be received with the utmost caution. No instrument on earth could ever be regarded as finally interpreted, while one of those who framed it was living, and was subject still to changes of opinion, if this rule were not recognized.

But while the testimony of individuals cannot guide us in interpreting the Constitution, the simultaneous or immediately subsequent action of the Society, may assist us, and very materially, in ascertaining the meaning then attributed to the clauses and terms of its organic law. If this action has been deliberate and uniform, and has met no objection, and if it goes back to the origin of the Society, and its earliest records,—then, as constituting a clear and consistent ‘contemporaneous exposition,’ it must well-nigh govern us in interpreting the Constitution. It is far more possible that we are deceived, at the distance of nearly half-a-century from the date of the instrument, than it is that they who framed it were deceived, as to their own intent and meaning, when they set it in operation.

With this outline of the principles to be applied in interpreting the first article of the Constitution, to which I think no one will object, I proceed to examine it.

“The only copies [of the Holy Scriptures] in the English language to be circulated by the Society, shall be of the version now in common use.” What is the meaning of this restrictive and authoritative clause? and, as cardinal in importance, what is the meaning of this word “version,” as here employed? Taking the copies of the Scriptures circulated in this country in 1816, does this word describe the whole of any one of them, or a part of many? and, secondly, if a part, what part?

The copies of the Scriptures in common use in this country at that time were not a few of them imported from England, from the presses of Oxford, Cambridge, London, and Edinburgh; some of them were from the press at Philadelphia, printed from plates prepared in England, and which followed the Oxford editions in their Headings, and their Contents of Chapters; and many of them were from other presses, of individuals and of societies, in New York, Trenton, Hartford, Boston, Worcester, Cooperstown, and other places. No two of the editions from different presses, published in this country, were identical in all points, though substantially so in regard to the Text. The editions published at Edinburgh, differed materially from those published at Oxford, in respect to the Headings, and the Contents of Chapters; and while the editions published at Philadelphia, for the reason I have mentioned, followed the Oxford copies in respect to these,—as I believe did also those which were published at Trenton,—those published in this city abridged these greatly, and variously altered them; and those published at Hartford, Boston, and other places, for the most part certainly, in their cheaper forms, entirely omitted them. The Bibles which were used *most* commonly in this country, in schools and in families, contained hardly any thing, after the title-page, except the Text.

Did this word “version,” then, as employed in the Constitution, apply to the whole of either of these books, in distinction from the rest, and make that the Standard, to which all copies should be conformed?

Most clearly it did not. For, if it had done so, the Book would have been specified, which, out of this variety, was to be the one Standard. The failure to specify it shows that no one was selected, no one was intended. This is a final and perfect answer to such an interpretation.

The earliest history of the Society, too, but adds emphasis to the answer; since the editions published by it in 1818, from its own plates, differed from those which had been published by it in the two years preceding from plates given to it.—It was not then a Book which it had adopted, to be forever reproduced, but a “version;” *the* version of the Scriptures which was then in common use, amid all this variety of editions.

And so we come again to the question: What was that “version?” What part of the several and differing editions was designated by it?

1. Historically, we must say, I am sure, it was the Translation; the Text of the Scriptures; since this was the only part of the book in which all these editions agreed, or seem to have aimed and sought to agree.—The Text of the Scriptures, (including the words, the punctuation, the italic and capital letters, and the division into chapters and verses,) was substantially, though not indeed literally, identical in all the editions. It had been so from the time when Aitken published at Philadelphia, in 1782, the first edition of the Scriptures ever issued on this continent in the English language. In that edition,—

which was specially recommended to the American people by the Congress of that day, and which had been examined and approved by its chaplains,—nothing was published except the Text. This Text was often reproduced afterwards; sometimes with, and more often without, any thing around it; and with differing accessories in those editions which added any such.—It seems to me, then, not only inferrible, but almost I might say demonstrable, from this history, that the Text, and nothing else, was the “version” intended by the framers of this article. If they meant more than this, then the version which they intended, whatever it was, was not at that time “in common use” in this country.

2. But Secondly, Etymology may help us on this point; the natural and usual meaning of words. It also points us, directly and unanswerably, to the Text of the Scriptures, as constituting the “version” which was to be circulated.

Webster says: “Version—Translation; that which is rendered from another language. Example, We have a good version of the Scriptures.”

Johnson and Walker, say simply; “Version, Translation.”

Richardson says: “Version—a Turning: sc. from one Language to another, a Translation, or Traduction.”

The Penny Cyclopedias: “The word Version, or Translation, is used to express the transferring of some written composition from one language into another.”

It is not needful to multiply authorities. It cannot be disputed that this is the natural and proper interpretation of this often-used term. It is the popular use of it, too. “Pope’s version of Homer;” “Carlyle’s version of Dante;” “Talboys’ version of *Æschylus* and *Sophocles*;” “the Septuagint version of the Old Testament Scriptures,” etc. etc.; we everywhere meet these expressions and the like. And in each the meaning of the term is the same; it is, Translation.

This Society itself incidentally so uses it, in one of its By-Laws, the 4th; wherein it is directed that the Board of Managers, in distributing the Sacred Scriptures in foreign languages, “shall encourage only such versions as conform in the principles of their translation to the common English version.”

The Society which now exists in this country, and which is prosecuting its efforts, for securing a new Translation of the Scriptures into the English Language, is popularly styled, and indeed is called in its own publications, the “New Version Society;” because its aim is a new Translation.

When we speak then of a version of the Scriptures,—unless we modify the term by some positive addition—we mean what is verted, rendered, transferred, from one language to another. The version in common use in this country in 1816 was the translation so made into English from the Hebrew

and Greek in the early part of the seventeenth century, and which still, in that early part of the nineteenth, was commonly circulated. If it be maintained that the Dedication, the Preface, the differing Headings and Contents of Chapters, often, but not always, connected with this in the English Edition, are a part of the version, then it is not a sneer, it is a strictly logical inquiry—“From what are they translated? And where are the originals?”

3. We come then to notice, Thirdly, the original preparation of this version in England. This also and most clearly shows, I think, that the Translated Text of the Scriptures was then understood as constituting the version; and that whatever else was added to this was not held as forming a constituent part of it. And though it is not necessary to go back to this point, it may perhaps assist us to do so.

The earliest proposition that looked to the preparation of our present version of the Scriptures in English was made, it is well known, at the “Hamp-ton Court Conference” in January, 1604. The proposal there presented by Rainolds, to him who was to be, but who was not yet, the King of England, was as follows :

“That a translation be made of the whole Bible, as consonant as can be to the original Hebrew and Greek; and this to be set out and printed, without any marginal notes, and only to be used in all churches of England, in time of divine service.” “Whereupon,” it is recorded, “His Highness wished that some special pains should be taken in that behalf, for one uniform translation; * * this to be done by the best learned in both Universities; after them to be reviewed by the Bishops, and the chief learned of the Church; from them to be presented to the Privy Council; etc.” Annals Eng. Bib., p. 402-3.

In accordance with this decision, the Translators were appointed, the portions of Scripture to be interpreted by each company were assigned to them respectively, and rules were given to guide them in their work. Among those rules these are important in the present connection :

1. “The ordinary Bible, read in the Church, commonly called the Bishops’ Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit.”

6. “No marginal notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew or Greek words, which cannot without some circumlocution so briefly and fitly be expressed in the text.”

8. “Every particular man of each company to take the same chapter, or chapters; and, having translated or amended them severally by himself, where he thinketh good, all to meet together, confer what they have done, and agree for their part what shall stand.”

9. “As one company hath despatched any one book in this manner, they shall send it to the rest, to be considered of seriously and judiciously: for his Majesty is careful on this point.”

The 10th rule provided that if any difference should arise between the

companies, as to the meaning of any passage, and should not have been settled by previous conference, it should be decided at the end of the work, by the Committee of final revision. And the 11th directed letters to be sent to any learned man in the land, not included in the College of Translators, for his judgment on any place of special obscurity.

So carefully and wisely was the then "new version" of the Scriptures arranged for, which was destined rapidly to supersede every other, to come over to this country with a Christian colonization, to remain for us, and we trust to remain for generations to come, the legacy of the largest learning of our Fathers, the living embodiment of their wisest, purest, and noblest speech, the channel of God's great messages to us, and the minister of life to multitudes of souls. It is not merely religious or pious, it is in the best sense rational, philosophical, to find in the wise preparation of this, at precisely that epoch, while the future great nations of England and America lay folded together in the narrow British isles, a manifest intervention of the Spirit of God!

At the beginning of 1610, or earlier, the work of the several companies of Translators had been completed. The Committee of Revision, of twelve persons, then labored upon it for three-fourths of a year more, and made the final copy for the press. It was published early in 1611, under the supervision of Drs. Bilson and Smith, who also prepared and prefixed the Preface, and the "summaries to the chapters." On what authority this was done, does not appear. That it was done as Editors, not as Translators, is only too apparent to be argued, since there was nothing from which to translate them. And that these appendages, which they added to the version, were not considered a constituent part of it, is to me most evident.

No provision was made for them in the Rules ordained and set forth by the King, for the guidance of the Translators. Indeed, if they were a part of the version, they directly and violently violated those rules at every point; since they were not conformed, *in any degree*, to the previous Headings found in the Bishops' Bible, which was ordered to be followed, but were totally diverse from them; they were not considered by the companies of Translators, nor by the Committee of Revision, of twelve; and if they were a part of the version, then they *were* "marginal notes affixed" for other purposes than "for the explanation of Hebrew and Greek words,"—which was directly and plainly opposed to a fundamental Rule.

The only possible alternative to these consequences is in admitting, what certainly is true, that these were Editorial additions to the version, to which no one felt called upon to object, but which were not considered a part of the version, as they had not been prepared by the companies of Translators, and had not been contemplated by that "Hampton Court Conference" which gave to their version the only "authority," in the technical sense, that it ever has had.

We are accustomed to speak of this version of the Scriptures as going back for its origin, through the Bishops' Bible, the Geneva Translation, Cranmer's and Coverdale's, to Tyndale's, and even at some points to Wickliffe's. This is literally true of the Translation of the Scriptures, which constitutes the version. But these editorial appendages to the Text, which sometimes are loosely confounded with the version, cannot be traced behind the pens of Bilson and Smith. No germs of them are found, as I have ascertained by personal inspection, in Coverdale or Cranmer, or the Geneva Translation, any more than in the Bishops'. And no Royal proclamation, no act of Parliament, no decree of Convocation, has ever given them, that I can ascertain, any other authority than intrinsically belongs to them. They stand to-day, as they were at first, simply the work of *the persons who edited the First Edition of our noble version.*

4. And so I am brought to notice, in the Fourth place, that the subsequent History of the version in England, as well as these proceedings which attended its preparation, shows that there the version has always been considered the Translation; and that all the accessories, even those which were in part prepared by the translators, as well as those affixed by the editors, have been held mere appendages; not a part of the version; not essential to its completeness; separable from it, at any time, and for any reason; susceptible of great change and modification in themselves; and when entirely removed from the version still leaving that entire and perfect.—On this point the evidence is so clear and cumulative that it seems to me impossible to resist it.

(1.) All the accessories have been often omitted, while yet the copies circulated without them have been certified as copies of "the authorized version."

Yet as long ago as 1632* a whole and large impression of the Bible was called in and suppressed, and the printers of it heavily fined, for one omission of the word "not" from the Text. Evidently, then, conspicuously, unanswerably, the accessories of the Text have not been considered a part of that "version," or as covered by its authority.

(2.) Part of these accessories have been omitted, and part retained, in multitudes of editions; and those headings that have been retained have been abridged, and still re-abridged, from the original forms; and yet the "version" has been published as complete, and as also unchanged. It is utterly, evidently, impossible to explain this, if these accessories are a part of that version.

(3.) In editions published from different presses, as the Edinburgh and the Oxford, those accessories have differed, distinctly and materially; and yet both equally have been certified as correct, containing in full "the authorized ver-

* This date is according to Anderson and to Cotton. The Bible, however, which is extremely rare, is said to bear the imprint 1631 on its title-page.

sion." For more than sixty years past, at least—certainly as far back as 1796, for so far I have traced it,—the Edinburgh editions, in their Contents of Chapters, have deviated often, and of evident purpose, from those of Oxford. Yet such variations could never have been allowed if these had not been held mere mutable appendages, and never an integral part of the version.

(4.) In editions from the same press—the Oxford, for example—these accessories have varied prominently and widely, at different times; while still, all the time, the Text of the Scriptures, and therefore the "version," has been declared, and has been in fact, the very same.—Dr. Blayney, in 1769, reconstructed entirely large numbers of the Headings, as well as revised, introduced, and exchanged parallel references; not limiting himself at all, in these respects, to a collation of previous editions. Yet his edition was not only *an* edition of the ancient version; it was for many years the recognized STANDARD EDITION of that version. He could not have changed two sentences in the Text, without agitating England from the Downs to the Tweed, and exposing himself with certainty to the charge of trying by stealth to bring in a new version. But he altered at pleasure the Contents of Chapters, left out some references, and wrote in others, as he himself said, such as had been suggested by others, or had "occurred from his own reading and observation," and he published a frank report of the work in the Gentleman's Magazine*—and no objection was made. He had changed the mere Editorial appendages with an unrestrained hand. But he had not touched, except to amend its typographical errors, the venerated "version."

(5.) In many editions published in England, as of Scott's Bible, the Oriental Bible edited by Cobbin, Bagster's editions, and others, the more usual Headings, references, etc., are entirely disregarded; new ones, and those altogether different, are substituted for them, and other and copious notes are added. Yet these are all and always described, and correctly too, as containing "the Sacred Scriptures, according to the authorized version."

If it is possible, then, in the nature of things, to prove any thing whatever by historical evidence, it seems to me to be demonstrated by these facts that from the date of the version until now that "version" has been held, in England at least, to consist in the translated Text of the Scriptures; and that all other things appended to this, have been consistently and consecutively held Editorial appendages; which might be omitted; which might be abridged; which might be different either in the issues of different presses, or in those of the same press at different times; for which entirely new ones might be substituted; while still the "version" remained intact. They were not a part, not the smallest fractional but still vital part, of this living version which the English People have prized so highly; or that People would never have suf-

* This Report will be found in the Appendix, document D.

ferred them, as they have done, to be thrown away at pleasure, to be prominently altered, and variously abridged. They are only the changeable scarfs it has worn ; and which have been shortened, lightened, laid aside, whenever the People who owned the version, would have it run abroad more nimbly.

5. But it may be said that this has reference only to England. I come then, to notice in the Fifth place, the fact that those proceedings which resulted in the formation of this Society show the same interpretation to have here prevailed ; that the version of the Scriptures was the translated Text, and nothing beyond this. The statement of this seems its instant demonstration ; but as it is denied, we must patiently examine it.

This Society grew out of many societies, local in their character, which existed before it. Twenty-eight of these united, through their representatives, in organizing this. The object of each of these previous societies was a missionary object ; to distribute the Word of God around them, to the needy and poor. And while in almost all their constitutions, so far as I have been able to find these, the language employed in regard to the version to be circulated by them is substantially identical—it was to be the version then commonly in use—some of them circulated it with the full Oxford Headings ; some with Headings greatly abridged, cut down to one line in place of eight ; and very many with no Headings at all. This usage of theirs is a final exposition of what *they* meant by the “version” of the Scriptures. It was the Text.—I have carefully looked over the Reports too, of these Societies, so far as preserved, and have everywhere been struck with the manifest fact that the whole attention of those who drew these, and of those who adopted them, was centered upon the Text, to the entire exclusion of every thing else. For example, the Oneida Society say in their Report, (1813,)—quoting it—“The Bible has God for its author, Salvation for its end, and Truth, without any mixture of error, for its matter.” “It is our Rule of faith and practice ;” etc. Therefore the Society had been organized (1810) to distribute “the common version, without note or comment.”

The Vermont Bible Society says, (1813,) “As the Bible is the standard to which professing Christians of all denominations appeal, because the great truths of Religion are here made known not in words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, all the real disciples of Jesus can cheerfully harmonize in exertions for causing every one to be supplied with this precious source of Divine instruction.”

The Constitution of the Otsego Co. Bible Society says, “To propagate the pure and unadulterated Word of God is the object of this Society.” (1814.)

The Union College Society, (1815,) “Our object, as expressed in our constitution, is the dissemination of the Word of God.”

The Philadelphia Society, (1814,) “A Production like this, in which the Divine Majesty is *everywhere heard*, speaking in a manner worthy of Himself,”

etc. Dr. Milnor, speaking before them the same year, described their object to be, "to communicate moral instruction and religious knowledge by the gratuitous distribution of the unadulterated Word of God ;" he adds : "they distribute it *as it came from the hands of its inspired authors.*"

All the sermons, addresses, etc., which I have been able to find, treat the theme in the same way. "What do the Scriptures teach ? From whom do they come ?"—this is often the line of the argument. The Bibles circulated by the different societies, with accessories or without, are spoken of indiscriminately, as the "Word of Life," the "Seed of the Word," the "Fountain of Truth," etc. etc. ; they are often described "as a final and universal Standard of faith and practice ;" and instances are recited in which the reading of them has led men to conversion. But no reference whatever is anywhere made, in any of these reports, or sermons, or speeches, to the Headings and other accessories. No slightest argument is ever based on them. And while frequent regretful mention is made of families or persons who were found to have only "imperfect copies" of the invaluable version, this is always because some part of the Text was wanting from them, never because the "accessories" were not there.

It seems to me, therefore, as plain as the sunrise, that what the founders of those early societies meant by the phrase "the version in common use," was the Text of the Scriptures, translated into English ; that on this only their thoughts were fixed, and that every thing else was, to their intelligent and earnest minds, entirely unimportant. It does not conflict at all with this view, it indeed corroborates, and signally because unintentionally confirms it, that the New Jersey Bible Society which does refer to these accessories refers to them specifically as "additions to the Text." Their own ideas in regard to this matter ran in evident harmony with the general current.

6. It only remains, then, to notice the Sixth point, the last I shall refer to on this part of the subject, that the History of the version as distributed by this Society, since its formation, demonstrates the same thing ; that the translated Text of the Scriptures was meant by this word, and nothing besides.

(1.) The first editions circulated by this Society, in 1816, were printed from plates presented to it by the New York Society, which had previously used them. In these the Headings etc. were in several parts altogether omitted ; in some, conformed to the abridged form in the English editions ; and in other and very prominent parts of the book, were *altogether new, not conformed to any previous editions that I can discover, but original with the editor.* Yet these were certainly held by the societies, both by that which had prepared them, and by this which had accepted them, to be true and proper and perfect copies of King James's version.

(2.) The editions first published by this Society from its own plates, in 1818, had *no* Contents of Chapters etc. whatever ; and no other accessories

than simple head-lines at the tops of the columns, which were not precisely or carefully conformed to those in any previous edition.

Yet the Society say in their report, that "particular pains have been taken to make the copies as correct as possible." Copies of what? Copies of the "version in common use;" i e. of the translated Text of the Scriptures. In another edition published in 1821, they returned to the headings of their edition of 1816—with its many headings *not in any degree conformed to the English!*

(3.) No editions whatever, with the full Headings and accessories, were published by the Society till 1830, or fourteen years after its formation. In the mean time it had circulated millions of copies of the Scriptures in English, every one of which it had vouched for as a veritable copy of "the version in common use."

(4.) From that time to the present, the larger number of the editions and the copies distributed by the Society have been without these; yet it never has once been claimed or allowed that any of these were imperfect reproductions of our revered "version." One whole edition was suppressed and destroyed for an error in a word, (putting Hundred for Husband,) in a clause of the Text. But the version, with all the accessories excluded, has been constantly circulated, and everywhere accepted, as entirely complete.

(5.) Foreign translations, while required to be closely conformed to our version in the principles of their translation, have never been required or asked to conform to it in this matter of the accessories. The version, out of the Hebrew and Greek, must agree with our version. Over the minor appendages to this version—beyond the exclusion of illustrative notes and critical comments—the Society has never extended its purview. And yet it allowed itself to be actually and violently *split into two*, rather than yield, by one hair's breadth, the vital, essential, and governing principle, that foreign versions must *in all that constitutes an integral part of them* be harmonious with our own.

(6.) I cannot find in any of the addresses made before the Society, and published by its order, from that eloquent address which commemorates the powers and the zeal of Dr. Mason at the outset of the Society, to the latest one at its last anniversary, any slightest reference or allusion whatever to any of these accessories as a part of the "version." The whole current of thought, which is indicated in these, has regarded them as mere appendages to the version, and never a part of it; without which this remained complete; with which it was not at all more complete. This argument, in itself, is not a final one. But in connection with what has preceded, as indicating a continuous and unconscious interpretation of this litigated word, it has its weight.

(7.) And to it I may add, seventhly and lastly, that the distinct and

unanimous impression of the Committee on Versions,—one of whom had been a member of the Society from its very commencement, and several of whom were men of eminent and conservative character, of large acquaintance with the history of the Society, and of a wide and intimate familiarity with all its operations—their impression, so settled, so unhesitating, so perfectly confident, that the version was, and was regarded as, the translated Text, and nothing besides—this shows how general as well as how natural the impression has been, which had become a mere axiom with them. They detail particularly, in their elaborate Report, the few and slight changes they have authorized in the Text, as being apprehensive that in these they might be thought to have modified the “version.” But in regard to the accessories of that Text, they say in their Report in so many words, without pausing to argue it, with an almost blunt frankness—“Here we tread on different ground.” * * * “It is the text, and strictly nothing but the text, that constitutes the Bible.” And so they give mere illustrations of the changes they have directed in its ‘surroundings,’ and publicly say that all the summaries of one of the books they have ordered recast. And no one objects to it, in this Board or outside of it, till six years afterward! This is really inexplicable, if their interpretation of this word “version” has not been the general one, as it certainly is the logical and historical one.

I am aware that in answer to this particular argument from the history of our Society, two extracts are adduced from Reports of the Society, of 1830 and 1832, in which it is declared that the Contents of the Chapters are recognized by the Society as constituting a part of King James’s version. By whom these declarations were drawn I do not know. They seem to have been prepared in answer to objections; as the readiest mode of justifying the previous insertion of the Headings, against which some objection had been urged. That they were deliberately adopted by the Society, after discussion, is I believe not affirmed. They seem then to have no more authority than that opposite *dictum* which I have quoted above, and which was adopted by this Board of Managers, that the Text alone is what constitutes the Bible. The obvious explanation of these clashing declarations, is that the question has never yet been properly adjudicated. It now for the first time comes before us, for a careful investigation and a final decision.

I have outlined thus, at much greater length than I should have desired, but at no greater length than has seemed to me necessary, the facts and the arguments which constrain me to conclude that by the word “version,” as used by the framers of our Constitution, is meant the Translated Text of the Scriptures, and nothing beyond. It was not a Book, but a “version,” which they adopted. And this version—Etymology and History both prove, to my apprehension, it seems to me nearly impossible to doubt it—was simply the Translation, made under King James. That was *the* “version,” from the

Hebrew and Greek into the English, in common use in this country in 1816; as it has been since, is now, and I trust will long continue to be. And that, and nothing more—that, as distinguished from all other translations,—is precisely, and with emphasis, pointed out by this phrase. That the Founders of the Society regarded the accessories as useful and natural helps to the version I do not doubt. No objection was made to them. But little attention seems to have been drawn to them. But it was the Text, and that alone, on which their ardent minds were fixed. This was the very Word of God, His wisdom and power to man's salvation, which they would distribute; and all that was around this, was of trifling importance. It might be freely and violently abridged; it might be altogether and of purpose omitted, for long periods of years; new Headings, even, *with no British sanction*, might be added to it; while still "the version" remained intact. If this is not a settled point, I cannot conceive how any point, to be established by historical evidence, can ever be settled.

I pass then to consider, much more briefly, the other connected restrictive phrase in the first clause of this article: "Without note or comment." What is the natural meaning and import, and what the legitimate scope and extent, of this requirement? If we can answer this, clearly and fully, our fundamental law is plainly before us.—"Note or comment" is a rhetorical expression, which has become a proverbial one. The two terms are evidently to be considered not as set over against each other, in the way of antithesis, but as substantially equivalent, the more general being enforced by the more particular, and both being used for the purposes of emphasis. A "comment" is an explanation; an exposition; note, added by the annotator *to evolve more fully what he conceives to be the secret or unapparent meaning contained in the text*. A "note," so far as it differs from this, describes properly a brief biographical or historical statement, appended to the text, to illustrate its meaning; or a religious instruction or precept in like manner added to it.

These were the classes of "notes" and "comments" which the Founders of this Society expressly, and of fixed purpose, excluded from the editions of the Scriptures which they were to publish. And the wisdom of their course no one will gainsay. Their primary intent undoubtedly was to exclude such comments as those of Scott, Doddridge, Henry, or Adam Clarke; and such notes as those which had gradually weighed down the Geneva translation, till they caused it to pass entirely out of use. But both in statement, and unquestionably also in their intention, they covered *all "comments" that would put a human and uninspired interpreter between God's words and the mind of the Reader*. They took their stand, as the Society must maintain it, on the right and duty of Private Judgment, in interpreting the Scriptures. And their purpose was, as demonstrated by their language, that all who believed in the Holy Scriptures, as in substance

at least correctly translated in the version they chose, should unite to distribute them without hindrance or embarrassment, whatever their particular church associations, or their special views of Prophecy or Theology. So they signalized their confidence in the power of God's Word, unaided by any human helps, undimmed by any human glosses; and so they sought to secure the utmost harmony and efficiency in the future enlarging operations of the Society.

That in this restriction they distinctly referred to the Contents of the Chapters, and the other accessories often joined with the text of the version they selected, is not, I think, proved, nor even rendered probable. As I have said, very little if any attention seems to have been drawn to these. They were not united with the majority of copies then in circulation. The facility with which the New York Society had left them out, and had essentially altered them, shows that they were thought of trifling importance. I do not think it was commonly supposed that there was comment in them. The Convention, therefore, neither approved, by specific endorsement, nor yet rejected any of them. They simply affirmed the cardinal principle, that *nothing of the nature of explanatory notes, or illustrative comments, should be connected with the copies of the version to be circulated by them*; and then they left this general principle, which was just and vital, and on which they were unanimously agreed, to be applied and made operative in future, as occasion should arise and propriety should suggest.

And their prudence in this course needs no demonstration. A precise and final Standard, then adopted, might have greatly embarrassed the Society in its future. The principle they laid down abides forever, definite, yet liberal, and susceptible of still newer and better applications as time goes on.

If, now, this general exposition which I have given of the first article in our Constitution be admitted as correct—and that it will be so in the end I cannot doubt, since it gives to the words their natural force, makes all the provisions of the article to harmonize, allows room for the future development of the Society, and is in accordance with its earliest history—the practical questions immediately before us come up for attention. These questions are three-fold: First, What is the power of the Society, under its Constitution, as concerning the "version"; i. e. the translated text of the Scriptures? Secondly, What is its power as concerning the "accessories?" And Thirdly, What is it expedient for it to do, in the circumstances in which it now is placed? At each of these questions I will rapidly glance. The principles I have laid down must of course govern my answer.

1. What is the power of the Society, under its Constitution, as concerning the "version;" i. e. the translated text of the Scriptures? I answer:

(1.) It has no power to produce, or even to distribute, another translation of the Holy Scriptures than that which it first chose. Until its Constitution

shall be radically changed, it is limited finally to this revered version. We should thank God for it!

(2.) It has no power to depart from this version, *by re-translating words or phrases*.—The restriction which guards the whole as a body, must guard as well each section and part of it. The principle that would change any one phrase in it, might extend by degrees to change the whole. And we have no right to make any new version, of any clause or any term.

(3.) The Society has power to make its own standard edition of this version, and to conform thereto all its copies.—This is inevitably and palpably involved in the fact that no edition is specified as the standard, and that those which were in use in 1816 did differ in particulars. The Society, then, must make its own standard, under subjection to the preceding rules; as it has done already, more than once; and as it distinctly, though indirectly, asserts its constant right to do in its 31st By-Law.

(4.) The Society has power in making its Standard, and afterward in perfecting it, to amend from time to time the orthography of its copies; so as to conform them, in this regard, to established changes in the use of the English language.—The exercise of this power is indispensable, in fact, to make the version the same to us which it was to those who first received it. Relatively to its readers, we change it disastrously, if we do not so amend it. We preserve it, if we do. This change, however, should rather keep behind, and never anticipate, the general change among English writers.

(5.) As this version of the Scriptures, i. e. the translated Text itself—with its capitals, italics, and all its punctuation—is not an unchangeable and now finished thing, even in England, but is still by slow degrees improving through more accurate punctuation, and a more careful conformity in the mode of printing it to the sense of the originals—this Society, which adopted that “version” as its own, and not a Book, or even an edition, has the right *to accept and incorporate in its copies improvements thus made*, and publicly set forth in the authorized and accepted British copies. It has done this frequently, with evident purpose, in years past. It may rightfully do it in time to come.

The translated Text of the Scriptures, as published in England from the Oxford press in 1816, was not in all points identical with that text as left by the Translators in 1611. Some changes of even considerable importance had been made and recognized, and universally accepted, in the intervening centuries. This Society availed itself of those improvements at the outset.*

The editions now published from the Oxford press are not precisely, in all points of punctuation, italic letters, etc., etc., identical with those which we

* A paper containing very full illustrations and proofs of this, will be found in the Appendix, document B.

first printed. There is a silent, and very slow, but a certain advance in them, of which instances could be given if the time would permit. Of all this progress, then, this Society may avail itself. As being pledged by its organic law, not forever to reproduce one specified Book, but always to reprint and distribute through its agencies one living historical version of the Scriptures, it may keep forever in even pace with the English presses in perfecting that version, and making it complete. This power, as I said, it has exercised heretofore. It does plainly possess it, by the terms of its constitution. It must possess it, to its own preservation. If it has it not, but must forever reprint from the copies which it adopted and published at the outset, or from the average of the copies then in use, then this limitation is a cord around its neck which will *strangle* it in the end. Its issues will gradually fall behind those of other presses. They will cease to reflect the ultimate attainment of English-speaking Christians in regard to this version. And those Christians will look elsewhere, inevitably, for their most perfect copies of it. We should not buy one of those copies to-day, for our own private use. It is only in this way that the Apocrypha has been got rid of. It was never put out of King James's version by Act of Parliament, by Decree of Convocation, or by Royal Proclamation. It has simply *dropped out*, with the progress of the version toward general circulation; and is to-day as legally a part of it as the Gospel of John.

It is a great principle, which we never must yield, that as it was not a Book that we adopted, but a living version, we have a right to all the improvement to be made in this in England, without re-translation.

(6.) As this loved and venerated version of the Scriptures is not the property of king or parliament, or of the English nation alone, but belongs in common to all the descendants of those by whom and for whom it was made, in 1611—to us, who are assembled on this side of the ocean, as well as to those who remain on the other,—it follows, I think, that this Society has power not only to avail itself of the progress *there* realized and recognized in regard to this version, but also *itself to assist this progress*; not, as I said before, by re-translating words or phrases, but by gradually recognizing and incorporating in its editions any results concerning the punctuation, and the modes of presenting the immutable Text, *upon which Christian scholars are agreed*.—For example, since it is universally admitted, without I think respectable dissent, that in 1 John ii. 23, the last clause (" he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also") is a part of the original Greek text, and not an interpolation, the Society must have power to put it out of italics, into the usual Roman character. So, too, after the word Anathema, and before Maranatha, in 1 Corinthians xvi. 22, the power to insert the period which should divide them, and which Christian scholars agree should divide them, must belong to the Society. Otherwise, it has less power to make the best edition of its version than any single Com-

munion would have, or even any private Publisher. It is bound by its Constitution not only to publish this version and no other, but *knowingly to perpetuate*, in its very mode of printing and punctuating this, *serious errors*, which are declared to be such by the unanimous judgment of Christian scholars.

A restriction so arbitrary and violent as this, cannot commend itself to the public judgment.

If it be replied, as it has been more than once, that the power to put the clause I have spoken of into the Roman character, implies the power to put some other clause or passage out of the Roman into italics, I answer that when the judgment and the conscience of Christian scholars are as fully agreed that the second change is authorized, and is needful, as they now are that the first is, then the change should be made; but never till then. We ought not to print as if it were man's word, *putting a palpable slur upon it*, what we know to be God's Word. We ought *not* to print as a Word of the Most High what is fully ascertained, and universally admitted, to have been nothing more than a clerk's interpolation. Whenever we and those for whom we officially act, are unanimously agreed that such it is, we should so indicate it—I cannot think that this needs any argument.

This Society, by its history, by its prominence and its power, by its position in the country, and its vast apparatus, is the great Producer of copies of the Bible for this immense American People. We have no Universities, to supervise the text; and no exclusively licensed presses. THIS SOCIETY, then, is charged by Providence with the work of making the most perfect copies of its version of the Scriptures for this whole Continent, for ages to come. And while in this work, it may clearly avail itself of the parallel labors of English presses, it is not, and should not be, strictly determined and limited by them. It may not re-translate, as I repeatedly have said, either phrase or term. But it may, and it should, incorporate in its copies any other results, concerning the minor particulars of the Text, on which the Christian scholarship of the age is fixedly agreed. The constant, effective, sufficient SAFEGUARD, against the least abuse of this power, is found in that jealousy, ever-living, ever-watchful, and certainly most laudable, of the Bible-reading Public, which regards the smallest suggestion of change with a sensitive suspicion, and which will not be induced to tolerate any,—not a change of a capital, not a change of a comma,—unless its propriety and importance are indisputable. I am clear in my conviction that the Society has this power, by its charter. It must exercise it most sparingly, and with cautious reserve, for its own preservation. It must exercise it, however, to be true to its history, and adequate to its Future; to fulfil its great office for God and for Man. And nothing in the meaning, and nothing in the history of this word "version," forbids us to exercise it. A living Translation, which is still being perfected in the manner of its imprint, is described by this term.

2. I come then to the Second question to be considered: What power has the Society, under its Constitution, in regard to the usual accessories of the version? including every thing other than the Text; but including, especially, as most conspicuous, the Contents of Chapters. And to this I answer:

(1.) First, and clearly, it has power to abridge them, or omit them altogether. This all must admit; because this power has been exercised from the outset, without scruple, and without dissent. If the "version" which is covered by our Constitution be simply the translated Text of the Scriptures, no man can deny or question this power.

(2.) It has no power to publish instructive, hortatory, or illustrative notes; like those contained, for example, in the editions of the Bible recently circulated by the American Tract Society. However useful or important these may be, they are prohibited to us.

(3.) It has no power to introduce such Headings, etc., as shall offer to the reader *an exposition of the Text, in its supposed interior meaning*. This would be simply to put a "comment" upon the version in the most brief, emphatic and memorable form, and in the most prominent place; and would be, therefore, *most obnoxious* to both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution. If we cannot have Headings without such exposition, we must have none.

(4.) If the principles which I have laid down concerning the Constitution be correct, as I think them to be, then the Society has no power, under its Constitution, to continue to print those Headings and Contents of Chapters which it has formerly published in some of its editions, but which are in the strictest sense "comments" upon the Text; *telling the reader before he sees this, what hidden significance he is to find in it*.—That the framers of the Constitution intended their principle to apply with specific force to these comments, I do not affirm; for I do not find, as I have intimated before, that their attention was drawn to them. But that their principle does apply to them, if justly developed, and rule them out, I cannot doubt; and a few examples will, I think, make it plain.

At the head of the 11th chapter of Daniel, for instance, it is said that the prophecy refers, from the 30th verse, to the "invasion and tyranny of the Romans." This it almost certainly does not, but to Antiochus Epiphanes. But whether it does or not, as no mention of either is made by name in the chapter itself, it is simply "comment," of the most conspicuous and obtrusive kind, to put either in the Headings.—At the head of Isaiah 27th, it is said that the last of that chapter, from the 12th verse, describes "the Church of Jews and Gentiles." On the other hand Dr. Alexander, and all respectable commentators of our day, agree that it refers simply to the restoration of the scattered Jews, on the downfall of Babylon. Either is "comment." But the one which this Society used to publish has the added demerit of being flagrantly

incorrect.—At the head of 1 Peter iii., it is said, “He declareth the benefits of Christ toward the old world.” This is just as strictly a comment upon the passage as is the contrary exposition of Bloomfield and others that the Saviour, after his death on earth, went and preached to the Antediluvians in Hades.—At the head of 1 John iv., it is said that teachers are to be tried “by the rules of the Catholic faith.” The only rule given in the text is that he is the true teacher who “confesses that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh.” Whether this is or is not identical with the “rules of the Catholic faith,” the American Bible Society is not called upon to affirm. It cannot pronounce any judgment on the question without clearly violating its fundamental Law.—At the head of the 49th Psalm the contents of the Psalm are described to be “an earnest persuasion to build the faith of resurrection, not on worldly power, but on God.” The same commentator to whom I have referred before, Dr. Alexander, agrees with all others of highest authority, that there is in the Psalm no reference whatever to the doctrine of Resurrection, but simply to God’s preserving for his children, in this world, that life which the rich man cannot preserve for himself or his kindred.—Psalm 68 is declared to be “a Prayer at the removing of the ark.” No mention of such removing is made in the Psalm, and it was more probably occasioned by some military victory.—So at the head of Psalm 140 it is said, “David prayeth to be delivered from Saul and Doeg.” No mention whatever either of Saul or of Doeg is found in the text. The insertion of their names is purely a “comment.”—At the head of the 4th chapter of 1st Corinthians, it is affirmed that the Apostles are “our Fathers in Christ, whom we ought to follow.” In the text, Paul speaks of himself alone, as sustaining that relation to the Corinthian Christians by virtue of his personal agency in their conversion, and not by virtue of his apostleship.—And at the head of 5th Luke it is said: Christ “likeneth faint-hearted and weak disciples to old bottles and worn garments.” His reference, on the other hand, unequivocally is to the essential and thorough incongruity between his free, spiritual, and inspiring Faith, and the rigid and obsolete forms of the Pharisees. The text, in its simplicity, unobscured by such a gloss as this Society used to put above it, would never have failed to convey this impression to every intelligent and right-minded reader.

It cannot, as I conceive, be denied or questioned, by any one who considers it, that such Headings as these, and the very many others of which these are but specimens, are in the strictest and most positive sense, “comments” upon the Text. *The word has no assignable meaning*, if it does not cover such. They are “comments” put purposely in the most condensed and energetic form, and set in the most conspicuous place; deriving an apparent authority from their place; and bringing a human exposition of the passage, and often an incorrect one, between the reader and the Word of the Almighty!

To publish these, is a plain, direct and emphatic violation, not only of the actual language of the Constitution, but of its total spirit and intent. It departs from the design of allowing all believers in the Holy Scriptures, as rendered into English in our revered version, to take part with equal earnestness in distributing them. It makes the Society hide God's Word behind palpable and serious errors of man. And if it were allowable—which it certainly is not—it would be derogatory to the dignity of the Society, contrary to its obligations to spread Truth and not error, as well as violative of the convictions of its members, to circulate these. If the founders of the Society meant any thing by their restriction, they must have meant to cut off such "comments" as these from the Scriptures. Their principle, in no strained or unnatural application, but in its legitimate development and out-working, inevitably removes them.

(5.) But, Fifthly, the Society while having no power to publish these Headings, now that their character as "comments" is ascertained, can make and publish, under its Constitution, such Headings as shall be strictly and simply *an index to the evident contents of the Text*, without attempting to add to it instructions, or to evolve and expound its interior meaning ; Headings, which shall not be "notes" on the one hand, like those affixed to the Geneva Translation, or "comments" on the other, like those which I have cited.—Its power to do this is simply that general incontestable power which every Institution must possess to do what is morally right and necessary, without violating its Constitution, to secure and increase its efficiency in its work.

Such Headings should be, as I have said, simply an index to the evident and unquestionable contents of the chapter. They are not then "comments," in any just sense. Nobody describes the index to a grammar as a commentary upon it ; or the index to a History, a Geography, a Philosophy, as forming a comment upon it, unless prepared for that purpose, or unless stating something not found in the Text. These Headings should be INDEXES ; only printed one by one, at the tops of the chapters, and not all together, at the end of the volume.

So far as possible, they should be expressed, too, *in the words of the Text* ; the equivalents of those which the Holy Ghost Himself inspired. Thus do we honor God most truly, who has chosen better words than our wisdom can substitute. He had a meaning and a method in all these ; and we honor that method, and Him who chose it, when we follow in His steps, and do not seek to substitute for His wisdom that wisdom of man which he himself has declared to be Folly. Thus do we conform, too, to the original plan of this Society, as vividly set forth in its Constitution. And thus do we bring the racy and vigorous English of the version, with its majestic and simple terms, its flavor of antiquity, its consecrated archaisms, its words that are histories, and that live in every part, into the Headings, to a far greater extent than

ever before. The fact that the Translators had nothing to do as a body with forming these, is as clearly shown in the language they include, as it is in the extant annals of the time. Such words as "misdeeming," "uncorrigibleness," "belligods," "eyesore," "mortification" (for humility,) "chested" (for confined,) "mured" (for buried,) "a pair of gallows," "bridles of impatiencey," "he poseth the Pharisees," and the like; and such statements as these: "God convinceth Job of imbecility;" "Samuel sent by God on pretense of a sacrifice;" "Jonathan, unwitting to his father, goeth;" "He reproveth the unjust parable of sour grapes;" "Gluttony and drunkenness are out of season, in the time of the Gospel;" "Satan, by calumnia, obtaineth leave to tempt Job;" "The Lord refuseth to go as he had promised, with the people;"—these would never have been incorporated in the headings, if they had been submitted to the body of Translators, or if the marvellous English of the version had been followed as it should have been in the framing of them. We rectify this by going back to the Text, to find our headings.

(6.) Sixthly, too; the Society has power, in like manner, to add to the version parallel references, prepared on the same plan; also maps, tables of coins, of measures, of weights, etc., and of chronology; in a word, to make the best and most useful Edition of its version of the Scriptures; but without adding "notes," of instruction or exhortation derived from the Text, or "comments" for the purpose of expounding its meaning.

Up to this limit the power of the Society seems to me most clearly and unquestionably to go; because not inhibited by the terms of the Constitution, as I have investigated these, and essential to its largest and its permanent efficiency. But at this point it encounters the provisions of the organic Law, and sharply terminates.

On the question what it is **EXPEDIENT** for the Society, and for this present Board of Managers, as conducting their business, to do in the circumstances in which they are now placed; I answer, with great deference to the judgment of others:—

1. It is expedient **TO DO RIGHT**; to use the powers we have by the Constitution, to refrain from using those which are not intrusted to us.

2. It is expedient to do what will make the Bibles which we distribute **NOT PROPERLY LIABLE TO OBJECTION FROM ANY**, because not interfering with the private understanding which any may have formed of the meaning of the Scriptures.

3. It is expedient to do what will make these Bibles which we distribute **MOST HELPFUL AND USEFUL TO THE UNLEARNED READER**.

4. It is expedient to do what will make these copies of the Scriptures **MOST TRULY ACCEPTABLE AND RESPECTABLE TO SCHOLARS**.

If we can ascertain what course that is which fulfils these conditions, and can faithfully follow it, it must command public confidence in the end. It is

the only course adapted to the dignity of this Society ; to its resources and opportunities, and its vast responsibilities ; the only one conservative of its prestige, of its means and of its character, and its ever vital principles ; the only one which is adequate to, or prophetic of, that splendid Future which we expect for it. I believe, as firmly as I believe any thing not a matter of consciousness, and not taught by inspiration, that the course which was entered upon by the Committee on Versions is such a course ; and that their work needs rather amendment, unto perfection, than reversal and destruction, to make it what we want.

I propose, therefore, the adoption of the following Preamble and Resolutions :—

Whereas, This Society was originally constituted, and is fixedly pledged by its fundamental law, to encourage the circulation of the Holy Scriptures in English, in that version of them, and in that version only, which was commonly in use in this country and in England in 1816 ; and in other versions, into foreign languages, which harmonize with this in the principles of their translation ;—and

Whereas, The Board of Managers, for this governing reason, has neither claimed nor exercised, nor proposed to exercise, any right whatever to change a single one of the words of this version, except to correct adjudged and palpable errors of the press ; nor even to amend the punctuation of the version, or the capital or Italic letters employed in it, except so far as to keep these conformed to the best English copies, and to the universal judgment of Christian scholars as to what, in these respects, will make the version most perfect ;—therefore,

Resolved. 1st. That all the changes made in the Text of the Scriptures, by the recent Committee of Revision,—including in the Text not only the words, but the punctuation, the brackets and parentheses, and the Italic or capital letters—which changes are not authorized by some edition before accepted in this country or Great Britain, or by the unanimous consent of Christian scholars, affirming their intrinsic propriety, be stricken out.

2d. That the present Standard Edition, with these emendations, be retained so far as the Text is concerned, as the standard of this Society ; and be commended to the Christian Public, as differing from previous editions only in the way of superior accuracy ;—presenting in the best and most perfect form thus far attained, that version of the Scriptures which this Society honors and preserves, and always has published.

3d. That it be referred to the Committee on Versions, to reconsider and revise the Headings, and Contents of Chapters, prepared by them for this edition, with a view to make them at once full and concise, more strictly and manifestly Biblical in tone, and more thoroughly pervaded by the antique but perennial spirit of the version ; that they be instructed, in prosecuting this

work, to consult more largely the editions of Great Britain, especially the Standard Edition of Blayney, in 1769; and also to solicit the assistance and advice of eminent scholars, in different branches of the Christian Church, in this country; and that all amendments, proposed by them, before being introduced into the plates, be reported to this Board for adoption or modification.*

By adopting this course, and applying hereafter the principles which I have indicated in the administration of this Society, I cannot doubt that its Future will be both prosperous and harmonious, and the utmost efficiency be secured to its operations, throughout the centuries which I trust are reserved for it.

All which is respectfully submitted.

NEW YORK, Jan. 14th, 1858.

R. S. STORRS, JR.

FURTHER ACTION OF THE BOARD, AND THE COMMITTEE.

Immediately upon the reading of the above Reports, an attempt was made to have that of the majority of the Committee adopted by the Board, under the pressure of a call for the "Previous Question," thus hastening the vote and forestalling debate; but in consequence of the prompt and spirited opposition to this, which was manifested by one or two independent members of the Board, the motion was withdrawn, and the discussion was allowed to proceed a little further. The final decision of the question was at length postponed to an adjourned meeting, to be held two weeks later; and the Resolutions respectively submitted by the majority and the minority of the Committee, with a separate series presented by two other members

* Lest it should be supposed by any, as it has been several times alleged,—that the principles involved in the foregoing Resolutions, and the argument pursued in the preceding Report, tend to introduce a *new* interpretation of the language of the first article of the Constitution, it is proper to show by the following extract from the amended By-Laws of the Society, prepared by some of the most distinguished members of the Board of Managers, lawyers and others, and formally adopted in 1854, that this is the interpretation which has heretofore been accepted and prevalent. The extract is from By-Law XVIII. :—"They [the Committee on Versions] shall, subject to the approval of the Board of Managers, **PREPARE ALL TITLES AND HEADINGS OF CHAPTERS, NOTES, AND MARGINAL REFERENCES, IN ALL COPIES OF THE SCRIPTURES PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY.**"

No clearer discrimination can be made than that which is here made between the mutable "accessories," and the unchangeable "version." The copies of the Scriptures referred to are, of course, *only* those in the English language. The Committee could prepare them for no other.

of it, were allowed to be printed. The Reports themselves, however, were carefully withheld from the public eye ; and were not even allowed to be read again, at the adjourned meeting (January 28) at which the final action was taken. Not a few of those, therefore, who voted on this question at the latter decisive meeting, did so without having heard at all the respective Reports.

At that meeting (January 28), the Majority Report, so far at least as the Resolutions appended to it were concerned, was adopted by the Board. Dr. Robinson then gave notice, on behalf of a majority of the members of the Committee on Versions, that at the next regular meeting, to be held a week later, they would submit a Protest against this action of the Board, and ask to have it recorded upon the Minutes. At that following meeting, held February 4th, the following paper, from such members of the Committee, was accordingly read, after some objections, with the request that it be placed upon the Minutes :

PROTEST.

THE UNDESIGNED, members of the Standing Committee on Versions, feel constrained to present their formal PROTEST against the Resolutions adopted by this Board at its recent adjourned meeting, on the subject of the Standard English Bible circulated by the Society, and of the proposed alterations in the same.

They protest against these resolutions,

FIRST: As assuming a principle which is distinctly and emphatically contradicted by the earliest history of this Society, as well as by the customs of the English presses, and the uniform and established usage of language ;—the principle, viz., that the accessories to that version of the Sacred Scriptures which this Society was organized to distribute, are an integral and permanent part of the version, and are, therefore, not susceptible of change and improvement, by the action of this Society, under its present Constitution.

They protest against these resolutions,

SECONDLY: As giving validity, and the authority of this Board, to changes heretofore introduced by entirely unknown persons—probably by editors, or by proof-readers—in the text of the Scriptures, as well as its accessories, and making these an incorporate and a co-ordinate part of the version to be circu-

lated by this Society; while the careful corrections unanimously suggested by the Committee on Versions, under their responsibilities to the Board, the Society, and the Christian Public, and which have been heretofore adopted by the Board, are rejected and set aside.

They protest against these resolutions,

THIRDLY: As attributing a practical infallibility to the editors and printers of previous editions of the Holy Scriptures; or, at least, as giving an altogether unwarranted sacredness and authority to even the palpable errors and oversights committed by these; thus exposing the Society to just criticism and censure, and a great and injurious limitation of its usefulness.

They protest against these resolutions,

FOURTHLY: As restoring, and in effect perpetuating, "Headings," and "Contents of Chapters," which were not prepared by the College of Translators by whom our excellent version was made; which have had no constant acceptance and support in the editions of the Scriptures issued in Great Britain, or in this country; which were not followed in the earliest Bibles published by this Society, and were not introduced into any of these until the year 1830; which contain many obsolete terms and phrases not found in the version, with not a few statements that are palpably untrue, being expressly contradicted by the text; and many of which "Headings," etc., are, in the judgment of the undersigned, in direct and plain contravention of the first article of the Constitution of the Society which inhibits it from publishing "note or comment."

They protest against these resolutions,

FIFTHLY: As tending, by necessary force and immediate consequence, to limit the function of the Committee on Versions—so far as the English version is concerned, with all its accessories—to that of a mere mechanical proof-reader; and to limit the function of the Society itself to that of a simple printing-establishment; divesting it of all the authority and right which it heretofore has claimed, and through this Board of Managers has more than once exercised, of perfecting, from time to time, by a more careful editing, and the correcting of errors before unnoticed, the copies of that inestimable version which it constantly has distributed.

They protest against these resolutions,

SIXTHLY: As having been the fruit of the action of a Committee, who, through inadvertence, or for some other reason, had sought no conference with the Committee on Versions, had presented to them no specifications of the charges made against their work, and had neither obtained nor requested from them any authorized statement or explanation, in answer to such charges, of the principles upon which that work had been conducted.

They protest against these resolutions,

SEVENTHLY: As casting, if not directly and in terms, yet by necessary

inference, an unmerited reproach on the Committee on Versions; whose members labored for three and a half years, conscientiously and diligently at the request of the Board, to prepare for the Society the most perfect edition possible of the version in common use; and whose work, at first unanimously accepted by the Board with thanks and applause, eulogized in the annual reports of the Society, received by all the purchasers of its Bibles without dissent, distributed as valuable gifts to Theological Seminaries, and sent with letters of strong commendation, by order of the Board, to eminent citizens in our own country, and even to sovereigns in Europe and elsewhere, is now after the lapse of nearly seven years, summarily discarded.

They protest against these resolutions,

EIGHTHLY: As further and needlessly increasing this reproach, by giving no specifications of the errors assumed to have been committed by the Committee on Versions in their work of revision; thus practically allowing the most exaggerated and injurious impressions which have been circulated of late concerning them and their work to pass uncontradicted, and seeming, in the absence of such contradiction, to give to these impressions the implicit sanction of the Board.

They protest against these Resolutions,

NINTHLY, and FINALLY: As having been adopted at a meeting of the Board at which the careful arguments and historical statements prepared in behalf of the several Reports then under consideration—which had before been prevented from being published—were not allowed to be read; thus preventing a large number of those present, and voting, from obtaining that knowledge of the facts concerned and the principles involved, which only these papers, as distinguished from individual and oral discussion, were fitted to afford.

On the grounds thus recited, with others not now needful to be specified, the undersigned respectfully but firmly PROTEST against the Resolutions thus adopted by the Board, and ask that this paper may be received, and be entered upon the minutes.

(Signed)

EDWARD ROBINSON,
SAMUEL H. TURNER,
THOMAS COCK,
THOMAS E. VERMILYE,
JAMES FLOY,
R. S. STORES, JR.*

NEW YORK, Feb. 4th, 1858.

* Signed on all the above-named grounds, except the Sixth, by Dr. Storrs. Having been Chairman of the Special Committee referred to, he does not feel called upon to express an opinion on the action of that Committee.

The undersigned was a member of the Standing Committee on Versions during the revision preparatory to the publication of the Bible now known as the Standard of the American Bible Society. He was satisfied then, as he is now, that the principle on which the Committee proceeded in preparing that edition was correct.

The undersigned therefore asks permission to append to the Protest of the present Committee on Versions against the Resolutions adopted by the Board on Thursday last, his opinion that the Committee did not violate or transcend the Constitution of the Society, either in letter or spirit, in the preparation of the said standard text, or of its accessories.

JOHN MCCLINTOCK.

NEW YORK, Feb. 4th, 1858.

The above paper having been read, was accepted by the Board, but permission to enter it on the minutes of the meeting was *refused*. The Rev. Dr. Turner then arose in his place, and offered his resignation of his office, as one of the Committee on Versions ; accompanying it with the following remarks :

MR. PRESIDENT :—Feeling myself compelled, by the circumstances in which I am placed by the late action of the Board, to resign my position as a member of the Committee on Versions, I beg permission to say a few words in vindication of the act. I am unwilling that any gentleman of this Board, by being left to draw his own conclusions respecting the motives which govern me, should ascribe my resignation simply to a personal feeling of disappointment, or to any indifference and want of interest in the great purposes of this Institution. I should certainly be not only willing, but desirous, to give both time and effort to the all-important duty devolved on the Committee, were it not clogged by conditions tending, as I conceive, to prevent the possibility of ever arriving at the most desirable result—that, namely, of publishing as correct an English Bible, of King James's version, as possible; and one adapted to the character and wants of the enlightened age in which we live. Among the many reasons which have determined me to resign, I shall mention only Two.

In the First place, in preparing the intended Standard, the Committee on Versions are limited to *COLLATION*. They are prohibited from exercising their own judgment, or using any knowledge which they may chance to have, in originating any improvement whatever. Not a particle is allowed to be introduced which had not already found its way into some previous edition ; and if any mistake has inadvertently been continued from one edition to

another, and has thus become general or common, it cannot be altered, however palpable and glaring may be the error. The "rod of iron" which remains uplifted over the heads of the members of the Committee, and by which the Board of Managers declare that they shall be "ruled," absolutely forbids even the insertion of a comma or a semicolon, the use of a capital letter, the introduction or omission of an italicized form, or any other such matter, unless it shall be found on collation to have been sanctioned by some previously printed Bible. And so also in respect to every reference, and marginal note.

While it controls those who are subservient to its authority in a manner unprecedented and unreasonable, thus compelling them to act with a relinquishment of that self-respect which every honorable man who undertakes such a duty may well be supposed to feel, and has a right to cherish, it stamps certain heretofore printed accessories with an immense weight of authority, and sanctions their absolute perpetuity so long as this Society shall last, or until it shall alter its Constitution. And yet some of these accessories, so established, were made nobody knows when or by whom; some of them are manifestly erroneous, and help to darken the meaning of the version; and some of them are misstatements, and contradictory to the very text of which they are professedly the index. I omit any illustrations, as, on a former occasion, when I had the honor of reading a paper before this Board, I cited several, the applicability of which no hearer could doubt. It was then said in reply, by a Reverend gentleman, that similar representations might have been made in reference to some portions of the translation; which, therefore, on the same principle, should itself be improved. But however true may be the remark in the abstract, in view of the authority of this Board the cases are widely dissimilar. The American Bible Society, and of course their agents, the Board of Managers, have no right, under their present constitution, to touch the Text, which is the translated Word of God. But in my opinion, the Constitution does not deprive them of the right to amend any accessories. The late action implies a denial of this right; and thus places the translated Word and its accessories, in this respect, on a perfect level.

I cannot, therefore, consent to take part, as a member of the Committee on Versions, in an undertaking founded, as I believe, on a mistaken principle, and giving no promise of such a result as is most to be desired.

Secondly, I cannot thus coöperate, because I think that the course which is demanded by the resolution under which the Committee are to act, is unworthy of this Society. It is indeed degrading it to a mere printing and publishing establishment; at least so far as the English Bible is concerned. But I have always regarded it, and I see no reason to abandon the view, as an Association representing the great body of Protestant Christendom in

America; united together to disseminate the Bible in various languages, and principally that old, venerated, and most excellent Translation, which has taught the mind, enlarged the heart, inspired the hope, and blessed the souls of millions of readers who knew no tongue but their vernacular, and also of multitudes of others who know that no language, either dead or living, can supply them with a better version. This glorious legacy the American Bible Society has undertaken to preserve for all subsequent generations of the Anglo-Saxon race, and to hand it down, in the best style, and fitted with the best accessories consistent with the Constitutional condition, "without note or comment."

I have always supposed that the phrase—"the version in common use"—does not apply to any thing beyond King James's *Translation, as existing when this Society was formed*. It cannot be denied that this is, at the very least, an interpretation which the words will bear. Inasmuch as the opposite, which excludes all accessories but such as had already been published, limits the capabilities of the Society, and cripples its efforts to obtain the best possible edition of the well-known version, I should have thought the more enlarged interpretation would have been eagerly seized. Mr. President, I may be radically wrong. The respect which a membership of nearly forty years is calculated to produce toward an Institution founded by men who were second to none in intelligence, enlargement of mind, religious character, zeal for truth, and Christian faith; an Institution which I had fondly hoped—possibly with an ill-judged enthusiasm, inconsistent, it may be said, with stern, cold, constitutional literalism, (though this I cannot acknowledge)—was formed with the purpose of producing and propagating and extending our own Bible, the very best ever translated from the inspired Hebrew and Greek, with such accessories also as might from their character claim the privilege, not to occupy the same throne with their divine Mistress, but in due reverence to sit at her feet, and thence to suggest her orders and her will; an Institution which I had considered as a sort of General Council of American Protestants, wherein the variously named Christian bodies, who regard the Scriptures as the sole Rule of Faith, are represented;—respect founded on *such* a basis, may possibly have led me to over-estimate its powers and its rights. But of this I am not conscious, and I should regret to become so. This Institution I had hoped would do, what I am sure no particular Church can do, prepare a Bible which all particular Churches might receive. But now I am forced to abandon the long-cherished delusion.

I seem to myself to behold the future Standard of the American Bible Society dispersed among the people, with its sanction of the statement first appearing in the edition of 1611,* that God sendeth the great Founder of

* The heading referred to is the first in 1 Sam. xvi. It is in these words: "Sam-

the school of the prophets to Bethlehem, that distinguished '*House of Bread*, that birth-place of Him who declares himself to be "the true bread from heaven, which giveth life unto the world,"—and sendeth Him for the very purpose of performing an act of His will,—"under pretense," however, of doing something else; thus affirming hypocritical conduct in Him who "is not a man that He should lie," but whose entire action always is and must be Truth, essential, absolute, immutable! I cannot believe that such a Bible can become permanent among the American Protestant communities. The inquisitive character of the age forbids such a supposition. Different denominations of Christians will, in course of time, prepare editions of "the version in common use" for themselves. Thus one great and ultimate object to be gained,—Unity of Protestant Christendom, in this great matter of a common Bible,—is lost, Lost, LOST!

For these reasons, and especially, Mr. President, for the Second, I cannot conscientiously coöperate in the wish of the Board, and therefore respectfully resign my place in the Committee on Versions.

SAMUEL H. TURNER.

After the presentation of the above paper by Rev. Dr. Turner, Drs. Robinson, Vermilye, and Floy, Mr. Vice President Cock, and Dr. Storrs, successively arose—although there had been among them no previous concert of action or plan in regard to the matter—and expressing, each for himself, their substantial agreement with the views of Dr. Turner, offered, for the same governing reasons, their several resignations of their places to the Board. These resignations, at a subsequent meeting, were accepted by the Board; and thus the Committee, which had labored so long, so assiduously, and so harmoniously, to make the best edition possible of the Holy Scriptures in English, of the "version in common use," was formally disbanded.

Its members are happy in being permitted to look back on

uel, sent by God under pretense of a sacrifice, cometh to Bethlehem." In the Bishops' Bible, printed by Robert Barker, in 1602, it is thus: "Samuel is reproved of God, and is sent to anoint David." That of the Geneva Bible, of 1584, is the same. In Cranmer's, of 1539, it is simply: "David is anoynted kyng." How could such a heading as that in King James's Bible have been introduced? It is hardly credible that it could have had the sanction of any of the Translators. The heading in the recent revised edition of the Bible (now rejected) is as follows: "Samuel sent to Bethlehem to anoint one of the sons of Jesse."

many hours of hallowed and fraternal christian intercourse, extending over a series of years, unbroken by a single word or feeling that can give them now occasion for regret, or for mutual apology. The great work which has enlisted so long their thoughts and prayers, and their earnest and united efforts, is still as dear to them as ever. And they cherish an abiding and undoubting confidence, that when the clamors of the late sudden and vehement agitation shall have all subsided, when the heats of the hour shall have passed away, when a fuller knowledge of the facts concerned shall have dispelled the present remarkable ignorance manifested by many whose real respect for the English Bible they do not question, when the more copious discussion which is now going on in the public prints shall have unfolded and illustrated all the principles involved in the work which they accomplished—it will be felt, and admitted, that they did a work, not perfect indeed in all its details, but pure in its aims, right in its method, honorable to the Society whose servants they were, useful to the readers of the Bibles which that distributes, and reverent toward Him who is the Author and Guardian of the Bible, in preparing their once accepted and applauded, but now discarded, STANDARD EDITION. To God, who is all-wise and mighty ; to the future Christian judgment of the land ; to Time, which brings good plans and efforts to rich fruition ; to the calm second-thought of even their most strenuous assailants ; they cheerfully commit the product of their labors.

APPENDIX

DOCUMENT A.

PAPER OF REV. DR. TURNER.

The following paper was read before the Board of Managers on the evening of November 19th, 1857.

The Committee on Versions had previously appointed a sub-committee of three, the Rev. Drs. Vermilye and Storrs, with myself, to examine the changes which had been introduced into the accessories of the new Standard. I was not present at the meeting of the Committee when the appointment was made, but believe that its design was simply this: to prepare themselves the better to form a right opinion respecting the excitement which had arisen in various parts of the country, and whether the action of the Committee had afforded materials for it, which might require some further action. This point being settled, they could become the better prepared to report to the Managers what course would, in their opinion, be most likely to quiet the excitement. It was with this object in view, that, as a member of the sub-committee, I began a collation of the headings in the new standard with those of the original edition of 1611, and the Oxford quarto of 1852, and occasionally some other late British editions. After proceeding through three or four books of the Old Testament, I was told by reliable authority that some very

prominent Managers were of the opinion that neither the Committee on Versions nor the Board itself had any constitutional right to alter at all the accessories, as they existed when the Society was formed. On hearing this, I suggested to Dr. Vermilye, the chairman of the sub-committee, whether, before we proceeded with the examination, it would not be best to ascertain the views of the Board. In this he coincided, as did also Dr. Storrs. In the hope of eliciting those views, the remarks that follow were submitted : S. H. T.

Mr. President, I trust that the discussion which the subject that has convened us to-day must necessarily produce, will be characterized by that Christian feeling, mutual affection, and principle of universal love, which pervaded the minds of those worthies to whom we are indebted for the formation of this great Religious and National Institution. It is not to be supposed that a band of Christian men, so associated, can agree in all minute points. Neither, indeed, is that sameness of character which would be necessary to form such a state of mind at all desirable; as it would require a condition of mental stagnation, or at least of indifference. But such an enlargement of mind and heart as prompts to a respectful and conciliatory deference to the views of others, although different from, and even opposite to our own, is demanded by that Christian law, which not only allows but requires "every man to be fully persuaded in his own mind." Yet while it is unchristian to insist upon absolute uniformity, and agreement on matters of "doubtful disputation," it is at least equally unchristian to abandon what is required by truth and right, or to acquiesce either in principles or practices by which error may be sustained. May the author of every perfect gift grant us grace to be governed on the one hand by the law of mutual forbearance, and on the other by the equally imperative law of TRUTH!

Four courses have occurred to me, one of which may now, if the Board think proper, receive its sanction. With permission I will state them, making each the subject of a few remarks. I would premise that, by the word "accessories" occasionally employed, I mean *every thing but the text* as divided into chapters and verses; every thing, including even capital letters, parentheses, punctuation and italics.

I. The first course may be stated as follows:—RESTORE EVERY THING EXACTLY AS IT WAS IN SOME PROMINENT EDITION OF THE SOCIETY BEFORE THE LATE REVISION WAS UNDERTAKEN, LEAVING THE ACCESSORIES UNTOUCHED.—This is demanded by some, and it is maintained that, under our

present Constitution, neither the Committee on Versions, nor the Managers themselves, have any right to touch former accessories, either now or ever hereafter. It is not my intention to discuss this point. I will only say that this ground is untenable, because inconsistent with past action of this Board never impugned by the Society. And it is utterly at variance with the character of those who formed the Constitution. They sympathized, in a religious aspect, with our great Revolutionary leaders in a civil. They were men with truly liberal views of Christian freedom ; views which, while conservative of truth, to which they clung with a martyr-like adherence, were marked also by that expansiveness of character which Truth alone can produce. Tenacious, doubtless, they would have been in retaining the substance of all accessories which embodied the revealed truth connected therewith ; and this very feeling would have been perfectly consistent with a desire of such change as might best develop it, so far as expressed in the text itself. Other objections to the course under consideration shall be stated hereafter, where they will be equally applicable.

II. The second course would be, for the Board of Managers EXPLICITLY TO SANCTION THE LATELY MADE ACCESSORIES, IN EVERY PARTICULAR.—This would be simply to run to the opposite extreme. Such a course would be highly objectionable in the present state of feeling, which so extensively pervades large portions of the religious community. I am sure it is the general desire of this Board, and of the Committee on Versions, to do every thing which may be right and proper, in order to conciliate different classes of objectors to the present Standard. Consequently, they would not tenaciously adhere to accessories which might be so modified and altered as to produce at least a general state of desirable quiet and unanimity. I have lately read all the headings in the Old Testament of the Standard Quarto edition, comparing them with those of 1611 and the Oxford Quarto of 1852. I cannot see how a candid reader can question their great superiority as a whole. And, undoubtedly, this might have been expected from the well-known competency of those respected members of the Committee on Versions who gave chief attention to the work ; in which they were aided by another Reverend and respected gentleman, who labored with industry and perseverance, which nothing but deep personal interest could have awakened. *Suum cuique tributo.* Nevertheless I would not advocate the expediency of adhering to all these accessories. I admit the propriety of restoring some of the earlier which have been excluded, because they seem preferable to those which have been substituted in their place. And even where the contrary is true, it may become a duty to yield to widely expressed opinion, in cases where no important principle is involved. I allude, especially, to certain portions in which Christ and the Church have been made to give place to different language, though equivalent in meaning. I am willing, in a suitable degree, to go back.

But, Mr. President, to prevent misapprehension of my meaning, I beg to state what I regard as the true principle on which headings of chapters ought to be constructed, if no very especial reason exists against acting on it. They should be adapted to the character of the contents *as appearing in the chapters, and not as developed by information in parts of Scripture of a subsequent age.*—Therefore it is that in Deut. xviii. 15, in the late edition the word Christ is rightly omitted. Not that any doubt is to be entertained of Christ being meant; but simply *in order that the inspired word of Moses should not be made clearer than the Spirit who inspired him thought good to make it.* On the same principle I would prefer in the Old Testament Messiah to Christ, and often Zion to Church. Nevertheless, I willingly yield to the expressed opinion of brethren, in various sections of the church, who have a right to claim a respectful hearing. Still, if any think that the headings should be constructed so as to give the meaning of chapters as it is developed in God's subsequent revelations, then I do not hesitate to say, that those of multitudes of earlier prophetic passages, as existing in all our older and later Bibles, should be altered. And this would give us a Bible *full* of "note and comment." It is enough to illustrate by referring to Gen. iii., which would afford material for a heading in which the Gospel plan of Salvation would be clearly developed.

III. According to the third course, THE WHOLE MATTER OF ACCESSORIES MAY BE REFERRED TO A COMMITTEE, and POWER GIVEN THEM TO MODIFY AND IMPROVE, LIMITING THEM, HOWEVER, TO THE INTRODUCTION OF NOTHING BUT WHAT MAY BE FOUND IN SOME RESPECTABLE PREVIOUS EDITION, ON THE PRINCIPLE THAT THE SOCIETY CAN ADMIT NOTHING NEW.*

This would be to authorize and settle permanently certain accessories which have heretofore been in general circulation, and appear in most of the leading editions before the publication of the present standard. And this is nothing less than to *perpetuate error.* It is a practical recognition of infallibility, at least it is ascribing power equivalent to infallibility, in regard to such adopted accessories, to their unknown authors. I intend no disrespect to the older headings or their unknown framers. I would have them carefully examined and considered. To neglect and despise the knowledge and wisdom of those who have preceded us, is to show oneself a conceited fool; but to be so subjected to their influence as to fear to exercise one's own mind in opposition to it, is to become the crouching intellectual Slave. I would not desire even, that what I still hope will be done before long, shall be thus stereotyped forever. Such an institution as the American Bible Society, ought to aim at perfection, and to go on improving, in matters not essential but only accessory to the Divine Word itself, *which according to the Constitution is not to be touched.*

* This coincides with the course lately adopted by the Board.

I cannot favor the course under review, for this would be to presume that the authors of the old accessories were necessarily superior in intelligence, knowledge, power of careful examination, critical acumen, good sense, religious feeling, and general capability for the work, to any who might subsequently be required to do the same work. And, with all due deference, I think their work, though in many respects very good and worthy of preservation, is not only susceptible of, but really requires, considerable alteration. I beg leave to illustrate this remark by introducing a few headings from the editions of 1611, which I doubt not are in most of the Bibles which were in common use ten years ago, and which I know to be in the following: Oxford quarto of 1841, and 1852; Oxford duodecimo, 1834; New York octavo, 1884; and octavo stereotyped for the Bible Society at Philadelphia, by T. RUTT, Shacklewell, London, 1816. In order not to be tedious, I select a very few specimens from multitudes which might be given.

Num. xx. 22: "At Mount Hor, Aaron resigneth his place to Eleazar, and dieth." The text says nothing about resignation, but only that Aaron's garments were put on Eleazar.

xxv. 10: "God giveth him (Phineas), an everlasting priesthood." The words of the text are "the covenant of an everlasting priesthood."

Deut. xxiii. 24: "Of trespasses." The subject of the text is, what a man may eat in his neighbor's vineyard or field, and not take away.

1 Sam. xvi. 1: "Samuel sent by God, under pretense of a sacrifice." This implies that God intended one thing, and pretended another.

2 Sam. xi. 6: "Uriah, sent for by David to cover the adultery, would not go home neither sober nor drunken." This is a most extraordinary comment, nothing like which appears in the text.

xxxi. 12: "David burieth the bones of Saul and Jonathan in his father's sepulchre." The necessary meaning of the words is, in the sepulchre of Jesse; but no doubt Saul's father was intended, as Kish occurs in the text.

1 Chron. xiv. 2: "David's felicity in people, wives and children." The *felicity* stated in vs. 2-8, consists in his confirmation in the kingdom, practising polygamy, (!) and having more sons and daughters, whose names are given.

Psalm xxii.: "David complaineth." So xl. In both these Messianic psalms, Christ is excluded.

xlix.: "An earnest persuasion to build the faith of resurrection not on worldly power." How preposterous to suppose it necessary to guard against what it were absurd to imagine that any man would think of doing!

lxxiii. 13: "The wound given thereby, diffidence." lxxvii.: "Fierce combat with diffidence." A retreating enemy truly! No doubt the author meant *distrust*; but that sense of the word has become obsolete.

Eccles. x. 16: "Of riot."—This heading is so very remarkable, that it becomes

proper to cite the words of the text and to call attention to some previous headings. The text runs thus: "Woe to thee, O land, when thy king is a child, and thy princes eat in the morning. Blessed art thou, O land, when thy princes eat in due season, for strength and not for drunkenness" Prefixed to this, as the only heading, are the two words, "of riot!" Now let us look at Cranmer's: "Fortunate and happy is that realm which hath a wise prince;" at the Genevan: "Of foolish kings and drunken princes, and of good kings and princes;" at the Bishops': "Of foolish kings and riotous princes, and of good kings and princes." The change made in the Bible of 1611, from those of the preceding years, is too striking to pass unobserved. The former translations speak out in the heading the evident meaning of the verses. But some of the leading men of the reign of the first Stuart, who seemed to endorse, in the fullest and most literal sense of the words, the old maxim that "the king can do no wrong," appear unwilling even to give to his Most Sacred Majesty a hint to the contrary, and, therefore, throw upon the people, (profanum vulgus! *am aaretz*, as the haughty Pharisee would say,*) what the inspired Word intended for the prince! And to do this, they reject the headings of all the preceding versions which had been generally received by the nation, and deservedly sanctioned by the highest authorities, in order to introduce an accommodation to Him who was obsequiously worshipped as "the breath of their nostrils!" How would the alarm have been rung through the church in our country, from Maine to Florida, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific, had the Committee on Versions made any *such* change in their standard Bible! But I proceed to adduce two other passages:

In Isa. liv., the Church of the Gentiles is made the whole subject of the Chapter. "The Prophet, for the comfort of the Gentiles, prophesieth the amplitude of their church:" and afterwards, "their" is repeated five times. But it is certain that a limitation of the topic of this chapter to Gentiles, is an unwarrantable restriction of its meaning.

lxvi. 19: "The Gentiles shall have a holy church, and see the damnation of the wicked." Quite a comfort to a holy church!

Now, I ask whether the American Bible Society are willing to pledge themselves to perpetuate such accessories to God's most Holy Word as these? And it may be asked, too, with good reason, do these gentlemen, clerical and lay, who so loudly call on the Board of Managers to restore *all the old accessories, just as they were at some former period*, (although what this is has not always been distinctly stated,) know that these, and other such headings, are a part of them? If so, I must wonder at their reverence for error, just because it is old! And if not, I must wonder the more at the positive assertions of some, respecting matters of which they were uninformed.

* See McCaul's *Old Paths*, pp. 8, 9, Lond. 1846.

IV. Although I have already trespassed too long upon the time of the Board, I must beg their indulgence while I state the fourth and last course which may be adopted. It is this: REFER THE WHOLE MATTER OF ACCESSORIES TO THE COMMITTEE ON VERSIONS, EITHER ALONE, OR AS ASSOCIATED WITH SOME OTHER MEMBERS, OR TO A NEW COMMITTEE, GIVING THEM POWER TO PROPOSE ALTERATIONS ACCORDING TO THEIR OWN JUDGMENT.

I hope, Mr. President, that this course may be acceptable to the Board. If so, I would also suggest, whether it would not be advisable to have these proposed alterations printed in the Monthly Record, in order that they may become known, and the Society at large thus have opportunity to form, and, if they choose, to express, either individually or collectively, an opinion about them. I desire none of these things to be "done in a corner," but in the full blaze of light. And, moreover, as it is not at all improbable that occasions may occur in which different members of the Committee may entertain different views, in such cases, let the different accessories proposed be brought before the Board of Managers for their consideration, and let them decide which shall be adopted. And lastly, as a due attention to the subject must be a work of some time, would it not be expedient to pass a resolution allowing the circulation of the old copies and the new standard both, until it shall be completed?

May God grant us the light of his "Holy Spirit, to have a right judgment in all things," so "that by His holy inspiration we may think those things which are good, and by His merciful guiding may perform the same, through our Lord Jesus Christ."

In preparing the preceding paper, the writer had occasionally in view a communication, which he had some time before addressed to a highly respected friend. As this bears directly on the general topic which has occasioned so much agitation among the Christian community, it is thought expedient to introduce some portions of it in this publication. The remarks in reference to changes made in the standard English Bibles since the publication of the original edition of 1611,—changes affecting the spelling, punctuation, capital letters, italics, and parentheses,—are however omitted. In all these respects the modern editions differ very much from the ancient.

On the subject of parallel references I might say much. But I prefer confining myself to one case, instead of adducing hundreds. In the edition of 1611, the references on the whole 71 verses of John vi. amount to *fifteen*. In the Edinburgh folio of 1793 there are *a hundred and fifty*; in the Oxford quarto of 1841 *about the same number*; and in that of 1852, exactly *one hun-*

dred and thirty-eight! Must all future parallel references stand as in King James's Bible? No modern editors have acted on this principle. The result of an examination of some of the earliest editions after that of 1611, is as follows: That of 1612, printed by Barker, has fifteen. So, also, the following: 1614, 1628, (that of Norton & Bill, King's printers,) 1629, 1630, 1632, 1637, 1639, 1660, 1661, 1666, 1671; and many of the old editions have none at all.

Now, with regard to Headings. In the first place, I have to remark, that their introduction and establishment, by any duly appointed authority, either civil or religious, has often been stated but never proved. Blaney's alterations were made on private authority. The headings introduced in 1611 varied much from those of former English translations, especially Cranmer's Bible. And yet, I am not aware that any public objection was made to them on that account. In subsequent editions they underwent changes, though for a time not great. And now I doubt whether an edition of *the last hundred years* is anywhere to be found, in which the headings agree in all particulars, with those of 1611. For instance, where is that prefixed to Ps. cxlii. 5? "And for that power which he hath given to the Church, to rule the consciences of men." The Oxford of 1841 and 1852, *very prudently* omit the last clause. The Edinburgh of 1793, reads simply: "And for that power which he hath given to his saints." The London of 1720, folio, instead of "to rule the consciences of men," substitutes, "for the conversion of sinners:" (Quere, by means of "two-edged swords, chains, and fitters of iron?") The old heading may be found in the Oxford quarto edition of 1754. What was originally a part of the heading is now *universally omitted*. And yet I presume none would venture to object on this account. The *principle*, then, of *removing in some cases*, is admitted. And can any one possibly wish to preserve the heading of 1 Sam. xvi., which represents God as intending one thing and *pretending* another? I may well presume a negative reply. And then the *principle of changing, in some cases*, follows. In both these respects the general principle has been repeatedly acted on. The argument, therefore, for or against the Headings of the lately published Bible, must turn on their propriety or expediency.

This opens before us an immense field through which, however content I might be to travel myself, I have neither the right nor the inclination to drag you. It is only by an induction of very numerous particulars, that any sound general conclusion can be drawn. I do not undertake to vindicate all the headings of the new edition. Many of them I am unacquainted with. Some few I object to, and intend to propose a return in some particulars to the old ones. It is not to be supposed that, of such a large number, every one can have been deliberately weighed and settled by every ordinary member of the Committee. This I have already said publicly in the Protestant Churchman, as well as many other things bearing on the subject in general;* and they need not be

* See the numbers for Jan. 31st, March 7th and 14th, 1857.

repeated. Still, I desire to secure your attention to a principle, which I think ought not to be ignored. I give my own private opinion, without any reference to what may have governed those members of the Committee who proposed the changes which have been objected to.

Passing over headings on the top of the page, I confine my remarks to those of the chapters. Here the principle before stated, under the second suggested course, was laid down and illustrated. And this same principle has shaped hundreds of headings in early editions. Let one illustration suffice. In Gen. iii. 15, the heading of 1611 is: "The promised seed." Why was not the word *Christ* added? and also His course of redeeming action? They might have been, with as much reason as the additions in multitudes of other places. In the Bishops' Bible of 1591, folio, London, we have, "Christ, the blessed seed of the woman, is promised;" in Cranmer's, 1539, "Christ our Saviour, is promised;" in the Geneva, 1584, "Christ is promised." I am not aware that the omission of Christ in the edition of 1611, was the occasion of any censure; and yet, surely, this could not have been owing to indifference.

On the principle which I have stated, Doeg and other names are, in the late standard, stricken out of the Psalms. In Ps. xxii, David is removed. He is made its subject in the edition of 1611, and the Geneva Bible, the other two just mentioned having no headings in the Psalms. Would the objectors to the action of the Committee on Versions desire the heading in King James's Bible to be retained? Both here and in Ps. xl, Christ is ignored in that, and *David represented as the only subject!*—It is on the same principle that Christ, Church, John Baptist, in Isa. xl, and other similar terms, are removed, and in many cases the very words of the text itself substituted in the Standard. Several of the old headings are Christian developments of what the inspired author himself "desired to see and hear, but did not." If, in opposition to the principle stated, it be correct that a Christian edition of the Old Testament should give full Christian expositions in the shape of headings, respecting prophecy, history, and patriarchal declarations, then of course the principle is false. But let this be proved, before the results of the other are exposed to public rebuke. And when it is proved, let it be unhesitatingly carried out. To adduce two illustrations, let the "unevangelical and anti-Christian" * headings in the edition of 1611 to Gen. iii. 15 and Ps. xxii. and xl, be "swept away," and others, decidedly Christian, be substituted. Let these develop the full import of the first promise, in the coming and action of Christ with all its blessed results, in his sufferings, and death, and resurrection, and ascension, and the happiness of mankind in general, both Heathens and Jews, and the ultimate salvation of God's people! Consistency would require this. But consistency is a rare jewel.

* I accommodate the language of the original opponent of the Society's action in this matter, not because I regard it as applicable, but because it is as really true of the old edition of 1611, as it is of the late standard of the American Bible Society

With regard to the headings in Solomon's Song, I shall restrict myself to two or three remarks.

First, I perfectly agree with Cranmer, that the fewer and briefer the headings are the better. He has but one, and that is confined to the first chapter and intended to cover the whole book. Secondly, that of a book so difficult now to be explained, any decided expression of opinion much beyond its own language, and what clearly appears to be intended, had better be avoided. Thirdly, that to represent it, or any part of it, as prophetically announcing and plainly developing particulars, which are only darkly, imperfectly, and in a general way, predicted elsewhere, is to substitute human opinion for divine revelation.* *The Book itself is the only right source of its headings.* [Various other points which were considered in the communication, are here omitted.]

The preceding paper, read before the Board, refers to a collation which had been made of the Old Testament headings in the late standard, with those of some of the more distinguished previous editions, and also to the impression which the comparison seemed naturally to produce. The collation begun by me as a member of the sub-committee, was continued through the whole of the Old Testament, for my own satisfaction. In illustration and confirmation of the impression before stated, it may be well to adduce some portions of the comparison. The Bible particularly referred to is the Oxford quarto of 1852, the headings of which correspond exactly with those of 1611, except in ten cases. In these the changes, though not great, are in every instance evidently intended to assimilate the more closely to the text. It may be sufficient to cite two: In Gen. xxxiii. 18, where the edition of 1611 is simply "Elohe," the Oxford has "El elohe." In Lev. iii. 1, the former has "meat offering," the latter, "peace offering." In both cases the Oxford corresponds exactly with the text.† It is evident, therefore, that the correct principle is therein avowed, and acted on.—I now proceed to the comparison, which the nature of the present publication requires to be very limited.

Leviticus xvi. 29, the early heading is, "The yearly feast of the expiations;" that of the late standard, "The yearly atonement."—The text relates to the

* In illustration of this remark, I refer particularly to the heading of Chapter xiii. 8, the text of which begins thus: "We have a little sister," &c. This is explained of "the calling of the Gentiles." Thus, language in the poem, the mystical meaning of which is, to say the least, doubtful and uncertain, is made to declare one of the most important truths of the Christian dispensation, and which is only fully developed in the inspired Apostolic Epistles.

† Also in 2 Kings, xix., "Esay" is changed three times into "Isaiah," to accord with the text. It is quite remarkable that in the edition of 1611, though the name of the prophet is uniformly spelled "Esay" in the heading, yet in the text the two forms "Esai," and "Isaiah," both occur: See vs. 2, 5, 6, 20.

great day of atonement, which took place on the 10th of the first civil month. This is not properly called a "feast," but is always represented as a period of affliction and expiation. See Exod. xxx. 10; Lev. xxiii. 27, et seq.; Num. xxix. 7, et seq.; where, in the second case, the old heading is, "The day of atonement"—and in the last, "The day of afflicting their souls."

Num. xx. 7: Former heading: "Moses smiting the rock, bringeth forth water;" later: "Moses smiteth the rock, and water cometh forth." So the text, ver. 11.—A similar improvement is made on 2 Kings, iv. 8, where "promiseth a son," is substituted for "giveth," as ver. 16 shows it ought to be. Compare also the different headings of 2 Kings v. 8.—xxi. 7: "healed by a brazen serpent," is properly altered into "healed in looking upon the brazen serpent."—xxx. 3: "The exception of a maid's vow." Any reader of the text will see that the subject is not exceptions, but vows in general. The new heading accords with it: "The vow of a maid," &c.

Deut. xxvii. 14. The old heading which speaks of "the curses pronounced on Mount Ebal," might be supposed to imply that the mountain was cursed. The ambiguity is removed in the late standard by changing *on* into *from*.

1 Sam. xvi. 1, and 2 Sam. xi. 6, have been already noted. The new headings are as follows: "Samuel sent to Bethlehem to anoint one of the sons of Jesse;" and, "2 David committeth adultery with Bath-sheba. 6 His attempt to conceal it."

2 Kings, xx. and Isaiah xxxix.; in these chapters the old headings correspond. The King of Babylon is represented as "sending because of the wonder." Nothing of the sort appears in the text, which ascribes the monarch's attention simply to the account which he had received of Hezekiah's sickness. "The wonder" is stated as a motive for sending, in 2 Chronicles, xxxii. 31. It is, however, entirely ignored in the heading there. When the text speaks of it, the heading passes it over unnoticed; but introduces it, when the text is silent! That of the late Standard is thus: "The King of Babylon sendeth to congratulate Hezekiah," adding in Isaiah, "upon his recovery," in accordance with the very words of the text.

Isaiah xli. "God expostulateth with his people," &c. But the text shows that the expostulation is not with his people, but *with his enemies*. The new heading, therefore, is wholly different: "God calleth upon idolaters to consider his power to aid his people," &c.

Ezekiel, xviii. 1. "God reproveth the unjust parable of sour grapes." It is very strange that such a statement should have been perpetuated in Standard Bibles, from generation to generation, for more than two hundred years; and stranger still, that intelligent men should, in the middle of the 19th century, determine to continue it *in perpetuum*. The obnoxious Standard, which has been accused of "tampering with the good old English Bible," introduces after "the," "people for their," and thus produces a heading of plain sense.

Daniel, i. 1. The old heading is as follows: "Jehoiakim's captivity, and

Ashpenaz taketh Daniel," &c. The natural impression on the reader's mind would be that Ashpenaz took Daniel, and the others whose names follow, captive. The new heading states the fact: "Selected to be taught the learning of the Chaldeans"—ii. 14 "Daniel obtaining some respite, findeth the dream." One would naturally ask how and where did he find it? The new heading runs thus: "14 Daniel obtaineth some respite; 19 The dream is revealed to him." viii. 13. The heading of the old editions is as follows: "The two thousand three hundred days of sacrifice." That of the late Standard is in these words: "The Sanctuary to be trodden down two thousand three hundred days." I shall quote the text, leaving it to the candor and common sense of every reader to decide for himself, which of the two ought to be rejected. "How long *shall be* the vision *concerning* the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the Sanctuary and the Host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the Sanctuary be cleansed."

Zech. xii. : here also the old heading in the Bible of 1611, and in most of the subsequent editions, is just as extraordinary; and, what is quite important, nothing like it appears in the older translations. "1 Jerusalem a cup of trembling to herself, 3 and a burdensome stone to her adversaries." The new heading retains this, omitting, however, the clause "to herself, 3" which radically changes the sense, and adapts it to the words of the text, which are as follows: "I will make Jerusalem a cup of trembling unto all the people round about. And in that day will I make Jerusalem a burdensome stone for all people."

In bringing these remarks to a close, I regret to express my own convictions; nevertheless, I cannot but say, that certain vague discussions, and unfounded statements, which the recent excitement has occasioned, have given too much ground to fear that, however widely the sacred Scriptures may have been disseminated by the agency of Bible Societies, they have not been so carefully and thoroughly studied, by men of various positions in the Church, as might reasonably have been expected. Furthermore, I must add, that erroneous headings, like those of which the above are a small specimen, ought not to be perpetuated; and that persons who take an interest in an institution, the great design of which is, to disseminate "the Holy Scriptures," are bound to use their best efforts, according to their position, to have such errors corrected. And I must add also, in simple justice to the character and action of the late Committee on Versions, that the members of the American Bible Society in general ought to know these two things, namely:—that the headings of the late Standard, taken as a whole, are most undoubtedly a great advance in improvement; and that the late Committee, as a body, and each individual in particular, were ready and willing to make such alterations as would have satisfied every pious, intelligent, and candid mind, which was not in a state of bondage to an imaginary Constitutional oppression.

APPENDIX.

DOCUMENT B.

The following article, contributed to the *Protestant Churchman* by the gentleman whose signature is attached to it, (Dr. Turner,) and published in that journal, October 3, 1857, contains a brief statement of facts which are very important in their bearing on the principles discussed in the foregoing pages, and is therefore here republished ; that it may be before the readers of this Pamphlet in a permanent and convenient form. Those, especially, who have the impression, which seems to be current, that the editions of the "common version," as published by the English and American presses prior to 1850, were identical at all points, except of orthography, with the editions of 1611, may be both surprised and instructed by this paper. They will find much light cast by it, also, on the preceding documents.

KING JAMES' BIBLE.

I hope that the respected editors of the *Protestant Churchman* will give a place in their columns to the following article from the New York *Observer*, of Sept. 17th. It ought to be carefully read by all who feel a proper interest in our authorized English Scriptures. It is particularly deserving of the attention of those who take it for granted that the original translation remained unaltered for nearly 250 years. In proportion as the primitive condition and progressive history of this Bible are investigated, it will be found that *while much has been said, little seems to have been known about it.* Most readers of the article will be greatly surprised, both at the original mistakes, and the subsequent changes here pointed out. I have compared the passages referred

to with the edition of 1611, and find the statements to correspond in general with its text. The few exceptions which I shall note may perhaps be explained on the supposition that the writer in the *Observer* has referred to the First edition of 1611, while I have only access to the Second. It may be well to state, what I imagine is not generally known, that in 1611 two editions of King James's Bible were published. They are distinguished by the different size of the type, and also by different printers'-marks.

THE ENGLISH VERSION.

HOW IT HAS BEEN IMPROVED.

Our English Bible in its present form, is the work of centuries. It is a great mistake to suppose, as many do, that it is now in all respects just as it was left by the translators; that a feeling of sacredness has ever been thrown around it, which has precluded all amendment or correction. No such feeling has existed, and no such course has been pursued in reference to it. It has never been considered perfect or unchangeable, but has been open to improvement, and has received it from age to age, here a little and there a little. Hence we have it in its present condition, in a more perfect conformity to THE INSPIRED ORIGINAL, than it was at first. It is of some importance, just now, to bear in mind this fact, and to understand the *modus operandi* in the matter. We shall, therefore, place before the readers of the *Observer* a specimen of the improvement, and indicate the way it has been made. We give first the reading in each case as the translators left it in the edition of 1611, and then what has been done with it since.

Gen. xix. 21: "I have accepted thee concerning this thing." In 1668 the word "also" was added, and is found in all the modern editions, and is required by the Hebrew.

Gen. xxxix. 16: "Until her lord came home." So it was printed for many years, but it was at length seen that the Hebrew and the context both require "his lord," and the change in the pronoun was made.

Gen. xlvi. 9: "But Joseph remembered the dream." As the Hebrew particle here is generally used as a continuative, and as the context shows no adversative idea here, the "But" was afterwards changed to "And."

Ex. xv. 25: "There he made a statute." So this sentence read till 1639, when the words "for them" were inserted after the word "made," and in accordance with the original.

Ex. xxi. 32: "He shall give unto their master thirty shekels." Thus all the copies have it until 1660, when the words "of silver" were added, as the Hebrew requires they should be.

Lev. xix. 34: "The stranger that dwelleth with you, shall be as one born amongst you." Thus this passage stood for generations; but it was discovered

at length that the Hebrew required that the words "unto you" should be inserted after the words "shall be," and they were inserted.

Lev. xx. 11: "Both of them shall be put to death." The original here is more imperative, and hence the word "surely" was inserted after "shall," and appears in all the modern copies.

1 Kings, vi. 1: "In the four hundred and fourscore years." Thus it was printed until 1769, when Dr Blaney changed "fourscore" to "eightieth."

2 Kings, xxi. 7: "Which I have chosen out of all tribes of Israel." Thus it was printed till 1659, when the definite article was inserted after "all."

1 Chron. vii. 5: "And all their brethren," &c., "were men of might." All the copies down to 1660 have it thus. But after that the word "valiant" was inserted before "men" as the Hebrew requires, and as the same words are translated in the 11th and 40th verses, "mighty men of valour."

2 Chron. xxvi. 18: "It pertaineth not unto thee." In the copies after 1629 we find this word changed to "appertaineth," and printed in italics.

Ezra, vi. 18: "The rest of the silver and gold." So in all the copies till Blaney in 1769 inserted "the" before "gold."

Esther, i. 8: "For the king had appointed." In 1629 the word "so" was inserted after "for," which expresses the meaning of the original more fully.

Job, xxxiii. 22: "His soul draweth near unto the grave." Thus it continued until 1660, when the word "Yea" was introduced before "His," as it should have been at first.

Job, xxxix. 14: "And warmeth them in dust." In 1629 the definite article was inserted before "dust."

Job, xli. 5: "Wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?" In 1661 we find the word "or" introduced before "wilt," as now in all the copies.

Prov. vii. 21: "With much fair speech." In 1661 the pronoun "her" was inserted before "much," as the Hebrew requires.

Ecc. xi. 7: "A pleasant thing is it." This was afterwards changed so as to read, "A pleasant thing it is."

Is. xxi. 3: "As the pangs of a woman that travelleth." In 1613 this was altered in the orthography so as to give the meaning of the original.

Jer. xl. 5: "Over all the cities of Judah." In 1661 the word "all" was omitted, and has been ever since, because it is not in the Hebrew.

Ez. iii. 11: "Unto thy people." Thus we find it until 1630, when the words "the children of," are inserted after "unto," as they should be.

Ez. xxxix. 11: "At that day." But in 1660 "at" was changed to "in," as more in accordance with the original.

Dan. iii. 15: "In the midst of a fiery furnace." So all the copies have it till 1630, when the word "burning" was inserted before "fiery," and because it is in the Hebrew.

Hos. vi. 5 : "I shewed them by the prophets." In 1613 this was correct ed, and "hewed" put in the place of "shewed."

Mic. vii. 7 : "I will look unto you the Lord." This was made to read in 1613, "I will look unto the Lord," and so ever since, as it should be.

Mal. i. 8 : "If he offer." In 1613 "he" was rightly changed to "ye."

Matt. ix. 34 : "He casteth out the devils." Thus it read until 1769, when Blaney omitted the article before "devils," and converted the assertion from a specific and particular meaning to a general one, and in this he has been followed by all the modern copies.

Matt. xii. 23 : "Is this the son of David ?" And so in all the editions until 1660, when the word "not" was inserted after "is," as the Greek requires.

Mark, v. 6 : "He came and worshipped him." So we find it until 1687, when "ran" was substituted for "came," and in accordance with the meaning of the original.

Mark, x. 18 : "There is no man good, but one, *that is*, God." Thus it stood till 1660, when it was changed so as to read, "there is none good," &c., which accords with the Greek, and avoids making God a man.

Luke, xix. 9 : "As he also is the son of Abraham." And thus it continued to be printed for some time; it was then changed so as to read "a son," &c.

Rom. iv. 12 : "But also walk." So it remained until 1769, when Blaney introduced the word "who" after "But," as the Greek requires.

Rom. vii. 2 : "the law of the husband." So the passage read until 1620, when "the husband" was changed to "her husband," as the sense requires.

1 Cor. x. 28 : "The earth," &c. So in all the copies until 1630, when "for" was inserted before "the," because it is in the original. *Typd. Cran. omit 'for'*

2 Cor. ix. 6 : "Shall reap sparingly," * * * "shall reap bountifully." In 1660 the word "also" was inserted after "reap," in both cases, and because the Greek demands it. *Typd. Cran. gen. omit the also.*

Eph. ii. 18 : "We both have an access by one Spirit." Thus in all the copies until Blaney removed the "an," and in this he has been followed ever since.

1 Tim. i. 4 : "Rather than edifying." Thus all the copies read until 1660, when we find the word "godly" inserted before "edifying," as it should be.

Rev. xvii. 2 : "Inhabiters of the earth." Thus it remained until Blaney changed "inhabiters" to "inhabitants."

Such is a *specimen* of the many changes which have been made; and for the better, in most cases. But how were they made? By whom? By what authority? Not, certainly, by the translators; not by legislative enactment; not by a royal decree. Nor were they made by following a rule like that of the *Princeton Review*, which perpetuates mistakes, and makes improvement

impossible. What if those who, in 1660, improved the version, had followed "the majority of copies," and had not looked at the *inspired original*; would they have seen or corrected the mistakes they did? The improvements that have been made were made, in many cases at least, by thus going behind the translators, and referring to the Hebrew and the Greek. As mistakes were seen, they were corrected. Men did not feel in those days that it is better to let such things remain than to undertake to correct them. This was wise.

CAMEROY.

In addition to the above, the very diligent and accurate and respected author has sent me a few other instances, which I think it right to append:

Gen. xxxix. 1: "The hand;" 1611; modern copies have "The hands."

Josh. iii. 11: "The covenant even the Lord;" 1611. In 1629 and since, it has been printed, "The covenant of the Lord."

Josh. iv. 5: "Take ye up;" 1611. Modern copies have, "Take you up."

2 Chron. iii. 10: "And in the most holy place;" 1611. In 1629 this was changed so as to read, "and in the most holy house."

Matt. iv. 13, 15: "Neptnali;" 1611. And so in all the old copies till Blaney changed it to "Nepthalim."

The edition of 1611 which I have examined, and which I believe to be the Second of that year, presents a few very slight differences from the above statements.

Gen. xlvi. 9: "And Joseph remembered the dreames."

Hos. vi. 5: "Hewed."

Mal. i. 8: "And if yee offer."

1 Tim. i. 4: "Rather *then* edifying." But *then* is plainly a typographical error for *than*.

It appears, therefore, that subsequent editors of King James's Bible did not hesitate to alter even the very words of the text, where the *necessary meaning of the original required alteration*. And surely such rigid adherence to any human work as refuses to alter at all, under any circumstances, savors of superstition, rather than due reverence. It is much to be wished that the two editions of 1611 may be carefully and thoroughly examined, and compared with the best of the late Oxford editions, before the publication of our intended Standard Bible. The Archbishop of Canterbury informs the Rev. Dr. Henry M. Mason, in a letter addressed to him under date of April 17, 1851, that "the Secretary of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge" had furnished him with the following statement from Mr. Combe, the superintendent of the Oxford press: "The text of all the Oxford editions of the Bible is now the same, and is in conformity with the edition of 1611," (which edition of the two?) "which is, and has been for many years, adopted for the stand-

ard text." From a comparison of some of the late Oxford Bibles with the second edition of 1611 and a reprint of the first, I know that they differ from those two continually in spelling, often in capital and small letters, and in parentheses, sometimes in punctuation, not unfrequently in headings, and once at least in a word, namely, "shamefacedness," in 1 Tim. ii. 9, where the oldest editions for nearly half a century have "*shamefastness*." Of parallel references thousands have been added; and more than a hundred in one chapter. I have compared the cases adduced by Cameroy with two quarto editions of the Oxford Bible, both of which are used in churches. Both were printed at the University press, one in 1841 and the other in 1852, "for the Protestant Episcopal Society for promoting Religion and Learning in the State of New York," and both "cum privilegio." These editions contain all the alterations he has specified, except those of 2 Kings, xxi. 7; and Job, xxxix. 14, which conform to the editions of 1611. I find also that they agree with the later editions in printing the word "that" in John, i. 9, in italics, while King James's Bible, in accordance with Cranmer's, the Geneva, and the Bishops', has it in the ordinary type.

The information, therefore, which was communicated to the Archbishop, and by him to Dr. Mason, is inaccurate. And if our proposed standard is to conform to the Oxford editions, with the exception merely of such "*typographical errors*" as may be discovered (see Journal of the last General Convention, pp. 77, 152, 209), it will certainly vary not a little from the original edition of 1611.

The truth is, that this whole subject is greatly misunderstood. Want of knowledge is very general. Late publications and discussions have proved this to be the case, both in our own Church, and among our Presbyterian brethren. Extravagant statements have appeared, and very lately from sources from which a purer and more healthful stream might have been expected. Oh, what an elevated and divine consciousness must have prompted the utterance: "**WE SPEAK THAT WE DO KNOW, AND TESTIFY THAT WE HAVE SEEN!**"

S. H. T.

APPENDIX.

DOCUMENT C.

The following careful and comprehensive analysis of the Majority Report was published in one of the religious Journals of this city, immediately upon the appearance of that Report. It is understood to have been contributed by a gentleman who has a very thorough acquaintance with all the facts and principles discussed, and who has given more time and labor to the investigation of the whole subject than probably any other person, not a member of the recent Committee on Versions. In reprinting it here, those portions complimentary to the late Committee are omitted, with one or two other parts of paragraphs not essential to the principal discussion.

THE MAJORITY REPORT.

We have at last, after much delay, and no little urgency from one quarter and another, the famous so-called "Majority Report" of the Committee of Nine. Before speaking of this document, we wish to chronicle a few facts in relation to the *appointment* and *composition* of this Committee, whose Report was so convincing and powerful as to reverse the whole action of the Society in relation to its Standard English Bible. With the exception of Dr. Storrs, who was placed on the Committee by mere Parliamentary rule, and Hon. B. F. Butler, every member of the Committee was known to be *adverse* to the work which they were appointed to consider. Some of them had openly and strongly committed themselves against it. Hence, when they came together as a Com-

mittee, and upon a comparison of their views and feelings, they were in favor of doing what they did at the close of their *arduous, extensive, and thorough* investigations.

This Committee made their Report to the Board on the 14th of January, 1858. It was then accepted, and the Resolutions with which it concluded, were severed from it and ordered to be printed for the use of the Board. But nothing more has been done with the Report itself. The Resolutions, recommended by the Committee, were adopted by the Board on the 28th of the same month ; but the means by which that end was gained, has hitherto been withheld from the public. And it now comes in such a questionable form, that we hardly know how to speak of it. The document is without any signatures attached to it. It purports to be the Report of the whole Committee, which we know it is not. Dr. Storrs, at least, had nothing to do with it. The simple truth is, that in its statements and reasoning it is the Report of a *minority* of the Committee. Only three of the eight who assented to the Resolutions appended to the Report, were present when the Report was read in the Committee and adopted, and ordered to be presented to the Board; namely, Messrs. Bedell, Lenox, and Tracy. But even their names are not attached to the document. This *nameless* feature in the Report is the more strange from the fact that the uniform usage, in cases where a Committee are not harmonious in the results reached by them, and where there is a majority and a minority report, is that each report is signed by those who differ in their views, or by some one of them in behalf of the others.

Before we proceed to examine this Report in detail, we would say in general that it is badly drawn. There is throughout the document, a want of particularity ; of definite, specific statement ; of all reference to the precise act condemned. The Committee seem unwilling to put their finger upon a single point, and say that here is wrong action ; unwilling to grapple with a solitary fact in the case, and to show that the thing done there is unwarranted. They affirm much, but prove nothing. They endorse charges "as well founded," but adduce no specifications. They assert that the Committee on Versions have erred, have gone too far ; but where or in what particulars, they are careful not to state. The reader will search in vain, in all this Report, for one solitary reference to a specific case of error, while he will find that, in warp and woof, the document is condemnatory. We complain of this. Our moral nature rises up against it. The commonest justice in this world would have allowed the accused the benefit of a specific reference to the places in the Bible where their action has been "unwarranted."

We have another remark to make. Every careful reader of the Report will perceive that, at the very outset the Committee *assume* what they should have most critically examined, proved, and settled ; namely : *what edition* of the Bible in common circulation is the genuine, "common version ;" or, in other

words, what is *the true reading* in this or that particular instance ; before they undertook to assert, as they do, that the Committee on Versions have departed from that "version" in those instances. This was imperative upon them ; and if they had addressed themselves to it as they should, they would never have indorsed such charges as they have. Every Biblical student knows that the several editions of the Bible now in circulation vary from each other in most, if not all, of the particulars complained of. But the Committee *assume* the contrary, and find fault with "the present Standard Bible, as unwarranted by the Constitution," and as "not admissible among the publications of the Society," because it differs from the Bible previously published by the Society. They really seem to think that in differing from this, it must of course differ from all others, which is not the fact. This *assumption* is the ground upon which they plant their lever. Hence they say :

1. That "changes have been made in the words of the text." But in *what text*? This is the first thing to be settled. The whole question turns upon this. If we take the text as the translators left it in these instances, where are the changes? We know of none. In Cant. iii. 5 and viii. 4, "she" has been put for "he," because the translators put it so in ii. 7. Thus it is in the Hebrew. Thus, too, it is in the previous translation, the Bishops' Bible, which was to be altered as little as possible, in making the present version. The correction of a printer's mistake is not changing the words of the text. They say,

2. That "alterations have been made in the sense of the text by changes in the punctuation, (including brackets and parentheses.)" Here again we ask in *what text* have alterations thus been made? The Committee specify no instance whatever. They say that such alterations have been made, but *where*, in what chapter and verse, they are very careful not to tell us. We deny the charge, and challenge the Committee to the proof. Let them show a single instance where the sense is altered by punctuation—by the omission of brackets or parentheses, and where it is not covered by the principles of collation. We call upon them for the proof. They say,

3. That "the sense of the text has been altered by changes in orthography." But where—in what words? Will the Committee give us an instance? Has the meaning of "sope" been changed by printing it "soap?" Is the meaning of "reward" altered in being spelt "rearward?" Or is "Korah" another person from our old "Core?" We really wish to be enlightened on this point. Cannot the Senior Secretary give us some light here? or, if it is in these points that he thinks the report is "imperfect," will some one of the Committee oblige us in this matter? They say they have found such alterations. Pray tell us where they are. We are anxious to see them. They say,

4. That "the sense of the text has been altered by the use or disuse of

capitals and italics." But here again they cite no instance. The broad assertion is made, but no case is given. We again deny the charge, and challenge them to prove the assertion true. Not an instance is there where the sense is affected by capitals, and where the Standard Bible is not in accordance with *some previous edition* of the "common version." And as to the use or disuse of italics changing the sense of the version, it is all moonshine. The meaning of the version is in *its words*, whether printed in Roman or italic letters. What meaning has the word "man," for example, when printed in Roman, different from what it has when printed in italics? The object in using italics in the Bible is to indicate to the reader that, though the word thus printed is not in the original, it is either implied, or is necessary in our language in order to express the full meaning of the original. But the meaning of a particular word is no more affected by italics than it is by a long *s* or a short one. The injustice of such charges, of such broad and positive assertions, in the absence of all proof, is too glaring to escape the notice of the most superficial reader. They say,

5. That "all the Bibles then (1816) in common use in this country, typographical errors of course excepted, were, it is believed, uniform in the words of the text." It is "believed"! By whom? By no man who has ever compared those Bibles. Such an assertion as this evinces an unpardonable ignorance in men sitting in judgment upon a work, which was *necessitated* by the very fact that the Bibles then circulated, and which are now circulated, were not and are not uniform in the words of the text. A few hours of careful comparison will satisfy any man on this subject. Nor are these differences mere errors of the press. "Any" and "none" in John, x. 28, 29, in the Edinburgh and American editions of the common version, are not the mistake of a printer. These Bibles differ in many instances, and intentionally, from each other. The Committee say,

6. That "all the Bibles then (1816) in this country, exhibited slight if any differences in respect of capitals, italics, and punctuation." It would be difficult for any one to make a wilder or more incorrect statement. It is as far from fact as any thing well can be. What, we would ask, did the recent collation develop but *thousands* of just such differences? And there were vastly more of such things in the Bibles circulated in this country in 1816 than there are now. The more careful and intelligent editing of the different editions of the Bible in England and in this country, has brought them into much greater uniformity in these things than they showed before, and yet even in this day that collation shows more than Twenty-Four Thousand differences of this kind. How the Committee could have made such a statement is to us unaccountable. They could not have made it, if they had compared those Bibles; and how they could assert such a thing without such examination, is stranger still. They say,

7. That "all the Bibles then (1816) in common use in this country, corresponded substantially with the original edition of King James's Translators, published in 1611." This is the culmination in the statements of this Report. How, we are tempted to ask, did the Committee know that they thus corresponded with that edition? Did they compare them throughout? And if not, then how could they take the ground that they do thus correspond? If they had ascertained the facts, they would never have ventured such a statement. Those Bibles differ, as every man knows who has compared them, from that edition of 1611, in a multitude of instances, and in the very things here complained of, namely: in words, in punctuation, in the use of brackets, parentheses, capitals, and italics; and they differ from it by *wholesale* in orthography. More than two columns of the *Protestant Churchman* were, some months ago, filled with a *specimen* merely of the differences simply in words. They say,

8. That "the accessories of the text," that is, "the contents of the chapters, the headings of the columns, the references, and the marginal readings, were contained in the first edition of the Translators." So the Committee think; but what are the facts? Do they sustain such an assertion? Not at all. We do not believe that one in twenty of the headings of the columns, in the edition of 1611, is now to be found in any of our Bibles. Many of its choice headings, which according to the *Presbyterian*, have in them "the true ring of the genuine metal," have been thrown away; such as "Isaiah naked"—"A book drowned"—"Jacob purged"—"Bel's vomit"—"Death swallowed"—"Belly gods," and the like. No less than *fifty-seven thousand* references have been added to the work of the Translators since their day. And there are now more than **TWO HUNDRED** Marginal Readings in our common English Bibles, which are not found in the edition of 1611. They say,

9. That these "accessories were amended in the authorized Oxford edition of 1769, and have continued with some modification in the Bibles printed at the authorized British presses to the present time." Is this a correct statement? Not at all. Dr. Blaney not only amended, but greatly *increased* the accessories. He revolutionized the Contents of the Chapters, about which so much noise is now made. His headings are different, both in quantity and in quality, from those in the edition of 1611, and in not a few instances convey an *entirely different meaning*. And as to their being "continued, with some modification in the Bibles printed at the authorized British presses to the present time," there could not be a greater mistake. They have been thrown aside in England for more than half a century, and are not found in any of the English Bibles now circulated. They say,

10. That while "the Bibles then (1816) in circulation in this country, presented a diversity in the headings of the chapters,—some having full headings, some brief ones, and some none at all"—yet "the full headings were in accord-

ance with the authorized English copies ;" and that " the brief ones were abridgments of the full headings," and were " conformed in character and style to them." This is a great mistake. The full headings, in the several editions of the Bible, then in common use in this country, were unlike. They differed from each other and from the English copies in language, in statements—in both quantity and quality—and, we may add, in *meaning* also, as will be found by any one who takes the trouble to compare them. And as to " the brief ones being abridgments of the full headings," it is all a dream. Take a single case. Turn to the full heading in Isaiah liii., and then look at the " abridgment " of this in the first Bible published by the Society: " Christ, the substitute of his people." Or read the full heading in Lam. iii., and then see what an " abridgment " of this we have in the Philadelphia Bible of 1812: " The prophet bewaileth his own calamities"—a meaning wholly *different* from that in the full heading. And thus it is throughout these Bibles. They say,

11. That " the practice of the Society, from its foundation until 1851, when the present standard Bible was printed, had been uniform," and that " no changes in the headings had been intentionally made, and no new ones introduced." This is not in accordance with facts. If the reader will turn to the octavo Testament and Psalms published to 1837, or to the duodecimo Testament and Psalms published in 1845, he will find throughout the Psalms no such uniform practice as is here claimed ;—he will find many changes made in the headings, which affect the sense ; and many new headings introduced, which convey an entirely different meaning from that in the old headings ;—he will find that, in principle, *the very same thing* has been done again and again by the Board, which is now condemned as " unauthorized by the Constitution." They say,

12. That " the errors or discrepancies then existing," (that is, in 1847, when the collation was undertaken,) " in the different Bibles, were typographical only." Is this a fact ? Will any man say that in John, x. 28, 29, the difference in words is " typographical only ?" Was the difference between the English and American copies in 1 John, ii. 23, a mistake of the printer ? Such assertions will surprise any intelligent reader, who understands the nature of these differences. They say,

13. That " after a careful consideration of the objections," made against the standard English Bible, " they are constrained to say that some of them are, in their judgment, well founded." They do not tell us what ones are sustained, and thus virtually indorse the whole of them. But with what justice this is done, will be seen by the above proof of their *careful consideration and accurate investigation* of the facts ! * * * * From beginning to end, the Report exhibits an entire misapprehension of the facts in the case ; a total overlooking of that which must shape and control any wise conclusion on the subject. We cannot, therefore, repress the surprise we feel that this Com-

mittee should, after a *few hours* of such superficial consideration of the matters submitted to them, have undertaken to pronounce upon points, which can be ascertained and settled, only as the Committee on Versions ascertained and settled them, namely, after *years* of patient, minute, and most careful and extensive examination and comparison. No wonder that the Secretary pronounces this Report "imperfect." It is superlatively so. The manner in which it meets and slides over the great Constitutional question involved in this controversy is really amusing, and shows that the Committee were utterly afraid to meet and grapple with that question.

Such, then, is the Report—such the means by which those who arrayed themselves against the Society's Standard Bible, succeeded, through the panic raised on the subject, in carrying their point. But there is a *Future* to this matter. The end *thus* gained cannot, and will not, be approved by an intelligent and thinking community, when the facts are all known. The *deliberation* of the Committee reminds us of the action of the French deputy, who, when approached by some half-dozen editors in Paris, and told that the government of Louis Philippe was at an end, (though the monarch was still on the throne,) and that the helm of state was offered to him, asked *five minutes* to decide the question, whether France should be a Republic or a Constitutional Monarchy; and then, covering his face with his hands, ran over the arguments for and against the proposition, and in that *brief moment* settled the question, and pronounced the fiat which drove the monarch from his throne, and changed the whole frame-work of the government. No wonder that the work of *five minutes* soon tumbled to pieces and showed its folly. We anticipate a similar result in the present case, from haste, misstatement, and panic.

URBANE.

[The following editorial article from the same paper, in which the preceding critique appeared, (THE INDEPENDENT of April 15,) discusses briefly one or two points of the Majority Report not so fully treated in the previous article, and is therefore republished.]

Without any further minute examination of the document in question in this place, we wish in a few words to call to the notice of our readers one or two obvious facts connected with it, which seem to us of some importance. The first of these is, that no *attempt* is made in the Report to evolve and establish, by just and lucid processes of reasoning, the **MEANING** of the article referred to in the Constitution. A certain loose and popular interpretation of the article in question is caught up and accepted, without argument, and apparently without any careful investigation, and is made the basis of the whole

Report. Yet this was the very point upon which the labor of the Committee should have been chiefly spent. In the absence of such an important element in the Report, it has no solidity, and of course settles nothing. The underpinning is wanting to the whole superstructure. No man will be in the least degree helped by it, in an effort to ascertain what is required, or what is forbidden, in the first article of the Constitution ; which all admit to be obligatory alike on the Board and the Society.

The Second noticeable peculiarity of this Report is, that several things which it states as facts are *not* facts, and that the *most important fact which it states is directly opposed to its own result!* It states, for example, that the Bibles circulated in this country at the formation of the American Society were, "it is believed," "uniform in the words of the Text." At least twenty instances are within our own knowledge, directly contradicting this statement ; where the Bibles, at that time circulated in this country, differed from each other in the very words of the Text. It states, further, that these Bibles "correspond substantially," in respect not only of words, but of italics, punctuation, capitals, etc., with the edition of the Translators in 1611. In one sense undoubtedly they did ; as did equally the recent revised Standard Edition. But if it be meant that they corresponded *exactly, or carefully*, with the first Edition, there are thousands upon thousands of instances to prove directly the reverse.

In regard to the Accessories the most important fact stated in the Report, is directly opposed to the whole result reached. This is, that "the abbreviated Headings of the edition of the New York Bible Society of 1816 [the year of the formation of the American Society] show variations from all the previous copies [English or American] which the Committee have seen ;" and that the American Society "commenced its work" by printing from these plates, continued to issue Bibles from them for some years thereafter, and in 1821 again readopted them !—All this is stated in this very Report. Surely, then, it may well be added, as the Committee do add : "The practice of the Society in that respect was conformable to the letter and spirit of the Constitution, and *established a practical construction of the Constitution itself.*" But when we come to ask what *is* that construction, instead of saying it is this : " Make the best and most helpful Headings you can ;" the majority of the Committee say it is this : " Make no change whatever in the Old Headings which is not authorized by *COLIATION* !" This is like proving that a man has invented and patented a machine, and then asking that he be debarred from an interest in it *on the ground* that he invented it !*

* The Supreme Court of the United States decided in 1808, **FOURTEEN YEARS** after the judicial system was established, in the case of *Stuart vs. Laird*, (1 Cranch, 299,) that a practice of the courts under the Constitution which had prevailed up to that time, *had fixed the meaning of the Constitution*, and left the question concerning this no longer an

We will not pursue the matter further, at present. Let every one read the Report for himself, and be fully persuaded in his own mind. The Board of Managers of the American Bible Society have suddenly and violently reversed their own consistent action of many years; have cast contempt on all they have said, for seven years past, in praise of their noble Standard Edition; have virtually charged themselves with the most remarkable ignorance in regard to their own Bibles, or else with complicity in plans to secretly violate the Constitution; have said to the Sovereigns of Europe, to the "eminent citizens" of our own country, to the Theological Seminaries, to all of whom they have sent Presentation Copies of their recent Standard, with laudatory letters, "Those books purporting to be Bibles which we sent you, violate our charter, and are 'not admissible among the publications of the Society;'" they have suffered one of their oldest and most laborious Committees to be entirely broken up; have disgusted many of the most earnest and intelligent friends of the Society, and some of its most effective auxiliaries; have set themselves behind the advance of the age, and against its common and growing light; and have yoked themselves henceforth to a principle which forbids their changing Sina into Sini, till some English printer has set the example, and opened the door for such beneficent change; they have done all this, and are now to expend at least TEN THOUSAND dollars of the money which the churches give to circulate God's Word in accomplishing this disastrous revolution:—and the whole is based on the statements and arguments of this Majority Report!

Let every man decide for himself whether the statement is so clear and exact, and so all-comprehending, whether the argument is so full and demonstrative, as to justify the result!

open one. We quote the express language of the Court, from Curtis's Decisions of the Supreme Court, Vol. I. 415: "To this objection, which is of recent date, it is sufficient to observe that *practice, and acquiescence under it*, for a period of several years, commencing with the organization of the judicial system, *affords an irresistible answer, and has indeed fixed the construction.* * * This practical exposition is too strong and obstinate to be shaken or controlled. Of course, *the question is at rest, and ought not now to be disturbed.*"

Why did not the practice of publishing Headings, both of chapters and of columns, palpably different from those contained in the English editions—which practice prevailed unquestioned in the American Bible Society for *FOURTEEN YEARS* after its formation, down to 1830—similarly establish a practical construction of *its* Constitution, to reverse which, at this day, is to go equally against the law and the facts? That "*contemporanea expositio*," which is the "*optima et fortissima in Lege*" of the Courts, is perfectly clear upon this point, and it cannot be overruled to satisfy a party, and allay a sudden clamor, without damage to the Society, and a violation of Right. The recent disposition to interpret its Constitution in a way to suit a present exigency, is one full of danger. The most flagrant departures from the meaning of the Constitution may be justified hereafter by this most rash and pernicious precedent.

APPENDIX.

DOCUMENT D.

The Letter of Dr. Blayney, contributed to the Gentleman's Magazine in 1769, and reprinted from that, is presented below. It will be seen that the work which he did, in preparing his STANDARD EDITION of "the version in common use," nearly ninety years ago, under the shadow of the English Universities, involves *all* the principles which were applied by the late Committee on Versions in their recent work; and that neither he, nor those who originated and supervised his labors, nor those who gratefully accepted the result of them, conceived the "version" to be changed by amendments of the punctuation "with a view to preserve the true sense;" by alterations in the Italic forms; by the addition of many parallel references; or by numerous and conspicuous changes in the Headings of columns, and of chapters. Has the Christian World been "advancing backward," since 1769? Are American Christians now *more* bound to the obsolete forms and errors of the past than they would have been if they had lived before the Revolution, in the earliest years of the reign of George III.?—It can hardly be that there will be two opinions on the question.

DR. BLAYNEY'S CORRECTION OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

(From the Gentleman's Magazine, printed in London in 1769.)

Having already given an account of Dr. Kennicott's Collation of the Hebrew Text of the Bible, to the end of the year 1768, the following Letter, we

hope, respecting the Collation and Correction of the English Text, will not be thought an improper supplement:—

To the Rev. the Vice-Chancellor, and the other Delegates of the Clarendon Press.

The Editor of the two editions of the Bible lately printed at the Clarendon Press thinks it his duty, now that he has completed the whole, in a course of between three and four years close application, to make his report to the Delegates of the manner in which that work has been executed, and hopes for their approbation.

In the first place, according to the instructions he received, the folio edition of 1611, that of 1701, published under the direction of Bishop Lloyd, and two Cambridge editions of a late date, one in quarto, the other in octavo, have been carefully collated; whereby many errors that were found in former editions have been corrected, and the text reformed to such a standard of purity as, it is presumed, is not to be met with in any other edition hitherto extant.

The punctuation has been carefully attended to, not only with a view to preserve the true sense, but also to uniformity, as far as was possible.

Frequent recourse has been had to the Hebrew and Greek originals; and as on other occasions, so with a special regard to the words not expressed in the Original languages, but which our translators have thought fit to insert in Italics, in order to make out the sense after the English idiom, or to preserve the connection. And though Dr. Paris made large corrections in this particular in an edition published at Cambridge, there still remained many necessary alterations which escaped the Doctor's notice, in making which the Editor chose not to rely on his own judgment singly, but submitted them all to the previous examination of the Select Committee, and particularly of the Principal of Hertford College, and Mr. Professor Wheeler. A list of the above alterations was intended to have been given in to the Vice-Chancellor at this time, but the Editor has not yet found time to make it completely out.

Considerable alterations have been made in the Heads or Contents prefixed to the Chapters, as will appear on inspection; and though the Editor is unwilling to enlarge upon the labor bestowed by himself in this particular, he cannot avoid taking notice of the peculiar obligations, which both himself and the public lie under, to the Principal of Hertford College, Mr. Griffith, of Pembroke College, Mr. Wheeler, Poetry Professor, and the late Warden of New College, so long as he lived to bear a part in it; who with a prodigious expense of time, and inexpressible fatigue to themselves, judiciously corrected and improved the rude and imperfect draughts of the Editor.

The running titles at the top of the Columns in each page, how trifling a circumstance soever it may appear, required no small degree of thought and attention.

Many of the proper names being left untranslated, whose etymology was necessary to be known, in order to a more perfect comprehension of the allusions in the text, the translation of them, under the inspection of the above-named Committee, has been, for the benefit of the unlearned, supplied in the margin.

Some obvious and material errors in the chronology have been considered and rectified.

The marginal references, even in Bishop Lloyd's Bible, had in many places suffered by the inaccuracy of the Press; subsequent editions had copied those *Errata*, and added many others of their own; so that it became absolutely necessary to turn to and compare the several passages, which has been done in every single instance, and by this precaution several false references brought to light, which would otherwise have passed unsuspected. It has been the care of the Editor to rectify these, as far as he could, by critical conjecture where the copies universally failed him, as they did in most of the errors discovered in Bishop Lloyd's edition. In some few instances he confesses himself to have been at a loss in finding out the true reference, though the corruption was manifest in the want of any the most distant resemblance between the passages compared together. Cases of this sort indeed did not often occur; so that a very small number only of the old references are, with the sanction of the Committee, omitted, and their places more usefully supplied.

It had been suggested by the late Archbishop of Canterbury, that an improvement might be made in the present editions of the Bible, by taking in a number of additional references, of which many useful ones, as he supposed, might be furnished from other editions referred to by him, and particularly from a Scotch edition, of which the present Vice-Chancellor was kind enough to lend a copy. The references found in it, which were indeed very numerous, having been severally turned to and examined, such of them were selected as the Editor judged most pertinent, together with others that occurred from his own reading and observation. In doing this he has endeavored to keep clear of mere fanciful allusions, of which too many presented themselves in the before-named Scotch edition, and to adhere as near as possible to the plan marked out in the former collection, made by Bishop Lloyd; pointing out such passages chiefly, where the same history or the same name were introduced, the same matter treated of, or sentiment expressed, or, at least, where parallels might fairly be drawn; and, sometimes, where a similar use of a particular word or expression tended to illustrate the application of it, on another occasion. The number of references being thus augmented considerably, the collection upon the whole will, it is hoped, be regarded as useful in the light of a Concordance, material as well as verbal, always at hand.

In this state the Quarto copy was sent to press, and the first proofs care-

fully collated with the copy, both text and margin; after which the second proofs were again read, and, generally speaking, the third likewise, not to mention the frequent revisions of proofs besides, which are common in correcting the press. This proved, indeed, a very tiresome and tedious task, but was not more than was absolutely necessary in order to attain the degree of accuracy that was wished. A particular attention was required with respect to the figures belonging to the marginal references, where errors were continually creeping in after a manner that would appear highly astonishing to those who have never been concerned in correcting multitudes of figures, as they came from the press.

When the Quarto sheets were printed off, the forms were lengthened out in order to make up the Folio edition; in doing which the parts were often so jumbled together, and such confusion introduced by misplacing the references, and mistaking the chronology, that nothing else would suffice than a fresh collation of the whole with the Quarto copy, and a repetition of almost the same trouble and care in the revisal, and in making up the running titles anew, as had been used before. But the Editor thinks he has just reason to congratulate himself on the opportunity hereby given him of discovering and correcting some few trivial inaccuracies, which, in spite of all his vigilance, had escaped his notice in the Quarto edition. So that the Folio edition is rendered by this somewhat the more perfect of the two, and therefore more fit to be recommended for a standard copy.

The Editor humbly hopes this account of his proceedings will not be unacceptable to the Board, and will think his time and pains not ill bestowed, if he shall have succeeded in his desire of giving satisfaction to those who honoured him with the employment, and of contributing in any wise to God's honor, and the public utility.

B. BLAYNEY.

HERTFORD COLLEGE, Oct. 25, 1769.

APPENDIX.

DOCUMENT E.

SOME extraordinary statements have been made public within a few weeks past, by the Rev. Dr. Brigham, senior Secretary of the American Bible Society—to the effect that “the work of altering the Headings was, as he believes, projected and carried through mainly by the Sub-Committee and the Collator;” that “there is not a line in their minutes which shows that the subject of Headings was once before the entire Committee, until the Sub-Committee had prepared copy, and plates were cast, for two Bibles at least and one Testament” (April, 1850); and that he himself “knew not how unlike the book was to what he supposed had been contracted for, until he saw the Report in print; and even then understood it not as he now does, on examining the book itself.” It becomes necessary therefore to say :

First,—That the Minutes referred to, and published by Dr. Brigham as those which he kept, as the permanent Secretary of the Committee on Versions, prove, on examination, to be radically defective, omitting many particulars which should have been included in them.

Secondly,—That *all* the retiring members of the Committee, except Dr. Floy—who was personally not conversant with the work of revision, coming into the Committee after it was completed—are agreed in their recollection of at least two meetings on this subject, of which no record appears in these Minutes; at

the one of which the general propriety of changing the Headings, where this was needed, was discussed and decided, and the proper rule to be applied in doing it was laid down ; at the other of which the particular changes to be made in the Headings of Solomon's Song were canvassed and decided.

Thirdly,—That the first of these meetings, so far as their recollection extends, and as is indicated also by the "copy" for the Revised Edition, still preserved at the Bible House, must have occurred as early as the autumn of 1848; and the other after an interval of some months.

Fourthly,—That the Rev. Dr. Brigham, as being uniformly present at the meetings of the Committee, had the same opportunities for knowing what was done, from first to last, as were possessed by any other member ; and he never intimated, to the remembrance of those then associated with him, any other objection to the changes proposed than was contained in what seemed a semi-playful remark, that "to make such changes might spoil his argument with the Unitarians," (in reference to the Heading at the top of John I.)

Fifthly,—That Dr. Brigham was never understood by the late members of the Committee, who were in frequent intercourse with him, to be otherwise than satisfied with what had been done, until after the summer of 1857. At that time he freely expressed the fear that the peace and safety of the Society would be imperilled by insisting on the changes which had been made; and he *then*, for the first time, so far as they are aware, stated the view of the Constitution which he has since advocated, in opposition to the earlier history of the Society, to the unanimous conviction of the Committee on Versions in 1848-51, and to the Amended By-Laws of the Board of Managers in 1854.

In consequence of these recent statements of the Secretary, the following paper was prepared, and published in the religious journals of this city, a few weeks since.

DR. BRIGHAM, AND THE LATE COMMITTEE ON VERSIONS.

In an article of last week (March 25th), the Rev. Dr. Brigham, in speaking of the Standard Bible of the American Bible Society, has made some statements, in view of which we desire to call attention to certain documentary testimony.

I. He says that "they [the Committee on Versions] looked then upon the subject of Headings (of chapters) as so unimportant as not to require any authority or consent from the Board;" that "there is not a line in their Minutes which shows that the subject of Headings was once before the entire Committee until" April, 1850; that he much doubts "whether the members of the Committee generally had any agency in regard to them, or gave any advice, until a late period at least;" and that "the work of altering the Headings was, as he believes, projected and carried through mainly by the Sub-Committee and Collator."

In contrast with these representations, we would present the following extract from the Annual Report of the American Bible Society for the year 1852, drawn up in this part by the Rev. Dr. Brigham. He is speaking of the appointment of the Sub-Committee, p. 33.

"With these definite rules laid down, it was considered best to appoint a Sub-Committee to meet frequently with the Collator, see that the rules adopted were followed, and, when any new question arose, to convene the whole Committee. This course was pursued with great patience and thoroughness, *both by the Committee and Sub-Committee, and their doings frequently made known to the Board as they proceeded.*"

This testimony is true. Dr. Brigham was the Secretary of the Committee on Versions; and it was his duty to record their proceedings, and lay the Minutes before the Board of Managers every month for their approval. If he did not do so, he of all men ought to be the last to take advantage of his own wrong, in order to bring an unjust charge against his former associates.

II. Dr. Brigham says that he "knew not how unlike the

book was to what he supposed had been contracted for, until he saw the Report (of the Committee on Versions) in print, and even then not as he does now," etc.

That he had at least an "intelligible view" of the matter, appears from another extract from the same Annual Report of 1852. He there copies and incorporates copious extracts from the Report of the Committee on Versions ; and this for the very purpose, as he says (p. 28), of "furnishing to all who may desire, an intelligible view of the changes which have been made in our Bible as the result of the collation."

III. Dr. Brigham further says, that he has "no recollection before that date (April, 1850) of any conversation in regard to Headings, except at one meeting of the Sub-Committee, when he happened to be present. The Eighth of Acts was then spoken of," etc.

The collation began with the New Testament ; and it was the heading of the Eighth of Acts which gave direct occasion for bringing the subject of the Headings before the whole Committee ; by whom a revision of them was ordered ; Dr. Brigham doubtless being present and assenting. This could not well have been later than October, 1848.

It is matter of public notoriety, that the plan of a Collation originated with Dr. Brigham ; that he first brought the matter before the Committee on Versions, and the Board of Managers ; that he was heart and hand with the Committee and Sub-Committee in carrying it through, to the end ; that he met always with the whole Committee as their Secretary, and often with the Sub-Committee ; that he, like all other members of the Committee, freely made suggestions as to improving the Headings, as well as other particulars, and freely opposed, when he saw fit, the suggestions of others ; and that nothing was ever adopted, to which Dr. Brigham, or any other member, did not assent.

It was in view of this state of facts that the Committee, at

the close of their final Report, make use of the following emphatic language.

"In thus closing their labors, the Committee desire, with grateful praise to God, distinctly and formally to state, that *no decision whatever has been made, and nothing whatever has been done, except with ENTIRE UNANIMITY on the part of the Committee and those acting with them.*"

The Report, of which this extract forms the close, was read before the Committee and adopted by them, Dr. Brigham being present and assenting. It was afterwards read before the Board of Managers, and unanimously adopted by them, and ordered to be printed, Dr. Brigham being present and assenting. More than all this, a year later, in the Annual Report of 1852, he cites and incorporates (pp. 36, 37) the close of the Committee's Report, including this passage with all its array of italics and capitals ; thus sending it forth to the world, in the name of the Society, with his own personal and official sanction.

EDWARD ROBINSON, THOS. E. VERMILYE, SAM'L. H. TURNER, THOMAS COCK. R. S. STORRS, Jr.,	<i>Members of the late Com. of Versions.</i>
---	--

NEW YORK, March 30th, 1858.

J. W. McLANE, *Collator.*

An extended article has recently been published also by Rev. Dr. McLane, giving his testimony in regard to the matters referred to by Dr. Brigham, as specified above ; from which we make, in closing, the following extracts :—

The history of the collation can be given in a few words, and will throw light upon the points in dispute. The subject was first brought before the Committee by the Secretary [Dr. Brigham], and by them referred to the Board. On the 7th of October, 1847, the Board considered the subject, and "referred it back to the Committee on Versions with directions to have the collation made, and to report the result to the Board." I was employed by the Board, through the recommendation of the Committee, to do this work ; and I entered upon it in February, 1848. Four recent British copies of the

Bible, together with the Society's standard, and the edition of 1611, were put into my hands, to be used in the collation. These six copies I read and compared throughout; and in all things pertaining to the *text*, I made an exact record, at the time, of the variations I found, and of all the action of the Committee and of the Sub-Committee thereon, as stated in their Report to the Board, page 18.

The collation began with the New Testament. My first report of variations was made to the Committee on the 26th of February, 1848. These were considered, and the action of the Committee thereon recorded by me, in a book prepared by me for the purpose. Thus we went on from time to time, ascertaining the facts in the case, and forming general conclusions in reference to what was to be done, until March 25th, 1848; when Dr. Robinson submitted a series of rules framed in view of what had thus far been presented, and intended as a guide to the Committee in the further prosecution of their work. (See their report, page 16.) I thus continued to meet the Committee, to report the variations I found, and to record their action thereon, until the 22d of September, 1848, when some additional rules were adopted by them as the result of further examination and experience, and as indicating still further their views of the proper method of procedure in this work. All these rules were drawn up as a *general outline* of the manner in which the Committee felt the revision should be conducted; and they were laid before the Board, not, as the Secretary says, because the Committee had been requested to do this by the Board, but because they wished the Board to understand the general method according to which they proposed to proceed; and because they wished also to know whether it was the pleasure of the Board that they should proceed thus, and before any thing was in print. The rules are all general in their character, and contain in them a specific provision for the suspension of the principal one in particular cases. The Board, on the 28th of September, 1848, indorsed these rules or general principles, and referred the whole subject of making the collation to the Committee, *with power*.

I had by this time nearly completed the collation of the four Gospels. The Committee met on the 2d of October, 1848; and the general principles, according to which the work was to be conducted, having been approved by the Board, Drs. Robinson and Vermilye were appointed a Sub-Committee "to inspect," not as the Secretary's minutes have it, "the further alterations made by the Reviser," for I was not the "Reviser." I made no "alterations;" absolutely none, anywhere or in any thing. It was not my business to make alterations. But they were appointed to "inspect the further alterations suggested by the Collator,"—that is, the cases which I might think did not come under these rules, or which ought to be excepted, or in which the collated copies were equally divided, and to see that such cases were settled according to these rules; and with instruction, in cases of peculiar importance,

to convene the whole Committee. Such was their commission, and never were men more careful or rigid in adhering to their instructions. They were unwilling to assume any responsibility. Wherever a doubt existed, or might be supposed to exist, the case was reserved for the action of the entire Committee, as they assert in their Report, page 18. They required me to note down, as we went along, in a book all such cases, and from time to time to bring them before the whole Committee for adjudication; which thing I did. Thus they acted throughout, and thus the work was done in all its parts. There was the most perfect harmony in every result.

But the Secretary now arrays himself against the work of the Committee as transcending, in some things, the limits of collation, and in others as contrary to constitutional principles long settled and acted on by him. He did not know, it seems, till recently, "how unlike the book is to what he supposed had been contracted for." But now that he does really understand what the book is, he pronounces sentence against it.

* * * * *

His main objection refers to what is outside of the text, namely, "the great change introduced in the headings of the chapters." Here, it seems to the Secretary, now that he knows what the book is, there is "almost a total revolution;" and he asserts it as "his belief," that "this work of altering the *headings* was projected and carried through mainly by the Sub-Committee and Collator"—that it was an "after thought"—was "attended to *after* the text had been collated," and that whatever "recollections" the Committee may have about the headings of the 8th of Acts and the Song of Solomon, they "were after 1850," that is, after the text had been collated. And he has "no fear that any auxiliary or candid member will call his record in question, from such unfixed, half-remembered statements of the late Version Committee and Collator." To justify himself in making such a statement the Secretary adduces,

1. "The Records of the Committee," kept by himself. "There is not a line in them," he says, "which shows that the subject of headings was before the entire Committee, until the Sub-Committee had prepared copy, and plates were cast for two Bibles at least and one Testament," that is, until the 28th of April, 1850. But why say "until" that time? Is there any thing in those Minutes which shows that the subject was *then*, or at *any time*, brought before the whole Committee? Not a line is there of the kind, if the Secretary has published all that relates to the subject. And why not assert that every thing to which objection has been made, was "projected and carried through by the Sub-Committee and Collator," without the knowledge of the Secretary and the entire Committee? for where is there a "line in all his Minutes," which shows that *any* of these things were ever brought before the entire Committee? Nothing can be plainer, or more susceptible of proof, than the

utter *defectiveness* of these Minutes as a full and complete Record of this collation. They do not even give us a naked skeleton of what was done. We have nothing but a few bones of the head and the feet. Turn to those Minutes and look at the wide and yawning chasm of nearly *two whole years*, which separates the beginning and partial completion of this work,—the Minute of 1848 from that of 1850, and which he bridges over with “naked memory.” What, I would ask; did not the whole Committee meet *once* in all that time, and act upon cases referred to them by the Sub-Committee? Did not the whole Committee act upon the change in a few proper names? Did they not authorize the insertion of the article in Matt. xii. 41? Did they not order that “broidered” in 1 Tim. ii. 9, should be changed to “braided?” that the word spirits should be printed with a small *s* in Rev. iv. 5? And yet where, in all the Secretary’s minutes, is there a word about these? and a *multitude* of other cases decided by the whole Committee? These Minutes, then, furnish no particular information in reference to any part of the collation. The Report of the Committee and the Book of the Collator are the only full and complete record of the facts of the work that was done.

2. “The Report of the Version Committee in 1851.” This, the Secretary says, “makes no mention of headings (except in their private addition to the fourth rule for collation) even down to their Minutes of 1850.” But is there any thing even then? Those Minutes state that the Sub-Committee had gone through the text, and that the Collator was then requested to collate the *marginal readings* and *references*, but nothing is said about the headings, and yet the revised books were going through the press. The simple fact was this.—The two Bibles and the Testament first printed under the direction of the Committee, and also the four British copies collated by me, *have no marginal readings and references*. These were not, therefore, collated at first. But when in 1850 it was determined to publish a Bible with these, then I was requested to collate these marginal readings and references; with a view, as the Committee state in their Report, to prepare another still more correct edition, which might be made the standard copy of the Society. For this collation other Bibles, having these accessories in them, were procured. The fact then that there is no mention made in the Report of their Minute of April 28th, 1850, of the Headings, is proof, not that they were then attended to, for there is no mention of this, but that they *had been already considered*, and the question about altering them *settled* by the whole Committee; as will appear, when we consider the Secretary’s last “circumstance,” which, he thinks, is of a “peculiar character.” It is.

* * * * *

3. “The books referred to in the Minutes of 1850.” Here, in the examination of these books, which were printed before 1850, the Secretary finds a complete demonstration in favor of his position, that the headings were “an

after thought," and were "altered after 1850." "Open," he exultingly exclaims, "the Pica Testament then finished," that is in 1850, "and you find the corrections of the *text* by the Committee, while the chapter-headings are those of old King James." If the Secretary will open this Testament and look at the headings, he will find that they are NOT "those of old King James." This, in the language of the Secretary, "settles the question."—This Testament began to be printed early in October, 1848, and was finished about the middle of February, 1849. But "look, again," says the Secretary, "into the new Brevier Bible of that year, (1850,) and you will find the same revised text in the New Testament with the same *old* headings; while in the Old Testament, stereotyped *after* the *New*, you will find both the revised *text* and the *new* headings." But if the Secretary will examine this Bible, he will NOT find the "*old*" headings in the New Testament; and he will find upon inquiry that the first part of the Old Testament was *not* "stereotyped *after* the *New*." My recollection is that the printers began upon *both* at the *same time*, and before they began to print the Pica Testament; but in a few weeks, and for convenience sake, the Pica Testament was made to take the lead in the work of printing and stereotyping. Here, then, we have the Pica Testament, the Pica Testament and Psalms, and the Brevier Testament, all printed and stereotyped in 1848 and 1849, and with *altered headings!* This brings us to the time when the question about altering these headings was considered, and settled by the whole Committee.

The Sub-Committee was appointed, as we have stated, on the 2d of October, 1848, and when the collation of the four Gospels was nearly completed. We soon reached the 8th of Acts. I called the attention of the Sub-Committee to the Heading of that chapter. They looked at it, and felt that it ought to be corrected, but at once said: "We will not take any responsibility in the matter. We will refer it to the whole Committee." This was done. The whole Committee was called together, and considered this and other headings, and came to a unanimous conclusion to alter such headings as required it, and for the reasons, and upon the principles, stated in their Report to the Board, page 26. The Secretary was present at this meeting, and no opposition to this work of altering the headings was made by him. The decision was unanimous.

The work of the Collator and the Sub-Committee was about a month in advance of that of the printers. The 8th of Acts was printed during the last week in November, 1848, and with *altered headings*, and shows that the decision to alter the headings was made *toward the close of October, 1848*. And I may further state, that the first copy, prepared by me according to the rules of the collation and the orderings of the Committee, is still in existence in the Bible House, and will prove what I have now stated. It will be seen, upon consulting that copy, which I began to give out in September, 1848, that the

contents of the chapters are not altered scarcely at all, until we reach the Acts of the Apostles; but with that book, and onward through the New Testament, and then in the Old Testament, which began to be printed in March, 1849, corrections in the headings will be found; thus showing that the alteration of the headings began with the Acts of the Apostles—which was in October, 1848. The question was then raised, What shall be done with the headings of the four Gospels already stereotyped, or nearly so? and the conclusion was, to alter the plates only so far as to remove the more objectionable things from these headings, and leave the rest for a subsequent revision, and for another edition of the Bible; and in that edition, (the octavo Reference Bible, published in 1852,) this was done, and a general revision of the revised headings made.

Here, then, in the autumn of 1848, when we came to the 8th of Acts, the question of altering the headings was considered and settled by the **WHOLE COMMITTEE**. So the members of the late Committee on Versions assert it was settled. So the copy then given out, and the Bibles then printed, both testify. And I solemnly declare, upon my honor as a man, and my faith as a Christian, that the question was then and there considered and settled by the whole Committee, and settled unanimously, and for the reasons, and upon the principles, stated by them in their Report to the Board. It is no “unfixed half remembered” thing with me. The fact is as certain to me as that I collated the Bible, or that I was then in existence. The headings in the Song of Solomon were recast, and adopted by the whole Committee; but how could this be after April, 1850, as the Secretary affirms, when those altered headings in the Pica and Brevier Bibles were then in print, and had been for months? The “belief” of the Secretary, then, that the alteration of the headings “was projected and carried through by the Sub-Committee and Collator,” has not *the slightest foundation in fact.*

* * * * *

I have but a word more in conclusion. In reading the communications of the Secretary, I have had a strange feeling. It has seemed to me impossible that I was reading the remarks of Dr. Brigham—impossible that the man who initiated this collation—who was conversant from week to week with the work of the Committee—who heard again and again the Report of the Committee—who praised so often and so eloquently the work of their hands, and sent his letters of commendation to the crowned heads of the earth—impossible that this man can now be arrayed against the Committee and their work. And yet it is even so, and we record the fact with deep regret, for we have loved and honored the man. We love him still, and can, and will, write in the sand all that has been painful to our feelings in his statements. The Bible question is far above all personal considerations.

JAMES W. McLANE.

BROOKLYN, E. D., April 28, 1858.

4900 020







—

—



3 2044 023 302 375

DATE DUE

DEMCO, INC. 38-2931

